C. SALLUSTIUS CRISPUS

BELLUM CATILINAE

A COMMENTARY

BY

P. McGUSHIN

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVII

C. SALLUSTIUS CRISPUS

BELLUM CATILINAE

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

W. DEN BOER • W. J. VERDENIUS • R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM QUADRAGESIMUM QUINTUM

P. McGUSHIN

C. SALLUSTIUS CRISPUS

BELLUM CATILINAE

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVII

C. SALLUSTIUS CRISPUS

BELLUM CATILINAE

A COMMENTARY

BY

P. McGUSHIN

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVII

ISBN 90 04 04835 9

Copyright 1977 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

UXORIQUE LIBERISQUE DILECTISSIMIS

CONTENTS

Preface ix
Abbreviations xi

Introduction 1
1. Life of Sallust 1
2. The writings of Sallust 5
3. The *Bellum Catilinae* 6
4. Judgements on Sallust 21
5. The text 24
6. Bibliographical note 24

Commentary 27

Appendixes
I. The introduction to *Bellum Catilinae* 291
II. Sources of the concepts in the introduction 293
III. The accuracy of Sallust's narrative 296
IV. The conspiracy of 66 B.C. 298
V. The portrait of Sempronia 302
VI. The execution of the arrested conspirators 304
VII. Caesar and Cato in Sallust 309

Index Nominum 312
Index Rerum 314
Index Verborum 316

PREFACE

This Commentary is a much revised version of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of London. In its original form it was written in London under the supervision of Professor O. Skutsch, to whose kindness and scholarship I owe much. It has benefited from the corrections and suggestions of my examiners, Professor R. Syme and Professor F. W. Walbank; from the valuable advice of an anonymous Cambridge referee; above all, from the perceptive comments of Professor F. R. D. Goodyear who did me the extraordinary kindness of reading the whole work in a late draft. Needless to say, I alone remain responsible for its shortcomings and for all the views I have expressed.

My debt of gratitude to institutions is also extensive: to the Library staff of my own University for their diligence in obtaining for me works not readily accessible; to the Director(s) and staff of the Londen Institute of Classical Studies and its Library for friendship and help over many years; to the Research Grants Committee of the University of Western Australia and to the Australian Academy of the Humanities for help towards the cost of publication.

Finally, I record my appreciation of the unfailing courtesy of the publishers, of the skill and efficiency of their staff.

P. McG.

Nedlands, Western Australia,
October 1976.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. EDITIONS

Ahlberg	Ahlberg, A. W., ed. Teubner, 1919.
Cortius	Kortte, G., ed. Leipzig, 1724.
Dietsch	Dietsch, R., 4th ed., 2 vols., Leipzig, 1876.
Ernout	Ernout, A., 4th ed. Paris, 1960.
Fabri	Fabri, E. W., ed. Nürnberg, 1845.
Gerlach	Gerlach, F. D., ed. Basle, 1870.
Jordan	Jordan, H., 3rd ed. Berlin, 1887.
Kritz	Kritz, J. F., 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1856.
Wirz	Jacobs, R., Wirz, H., and Kurfess, A., 11th ed. Berlin, 1922.

2. STUDIES ON SALLUST

Büchner	Büchner, K., *Sallust*, Heidelberg, 1960.
Earl	Earl, D. C., *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge, 1961.
Kroll	Kroll, W., "Die Sprache des Sallust", *Glotta* 15 (1927), 280ff.
Perrochat	Perrochat, P., *Les modèles grecs de Salluste*, Paris, 1949.
Syme	Syme, Sir Ronald, *Sallust*, California/Cambridge, 1964.

3. FRAGMENTS ETC.

References to fragmentary remains of historians, to epitomizers, to grammarians etc. are to standard editions. Thus:

Accius (298R)	Ribbeck, O., *Scaenica Romanorum Poesis*, 2 vols. 3rd ed. Teubner, 1871-73.
Asconius (33C)	Clark, A. C., *Q. Asconii Pediani Commentarii*, Oxford, 1907.
Cato (Orig. 2.33J)	Jordan, H., *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae exstant*, Lipsiae, 1860.
Charisius 1.140K	Keil, H., *Grammatici Latini*, 7 vols. and suppl., Hildesheim, 1961.
Ennius 36V	Vahlen, J., *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, Teubner, 1928.
Festus (339L)	Lindsay, W. M., *Festus*, Teubner, 1913.
HRR	Peter, H., *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Teubner, 1967.
Lucilius (612M)	Marx, F., *Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Teubner, 1904-05.
Nonius (483L)	Lindsay, W. M., *Nonius Marcellus*, Teubner, 1903.

4. WORKS OF REFERENCE

Bennett	Bennett, C. E., *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2 vols., Hildesheim, 1966.
Broughton, *MRR*	Broughton, T. R. S., *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 2 vols., New York, 1951-52.
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
Greenidge	Greenidge, A. H. J., *The Legal Procedure in Cicero's Time*, Oxford, 1901.

Kühner-Stegmann	Kühner, R. - Stegmann, C., *Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 vols., 3rd ed., Leverkusen, 1955.
L-H-S	Leumann, M., Hofmann, J., Szantyr B., *Lateinische Grammatik* 2. (Handbuch d. Altertumswissenschaft II, 2) Munich, 1965.
Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*	Mommsen T., *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3 vols., 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1887.
——, *Strafrecht*	——, *Römisches Strafrecht*, Darmstadt, 1955.
Neue-Wagener	Neue, F., Wagener, C., *Formenlehre der lateinische Sprache*, 3 vols., 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1902.
Ogilvie	Ogilvie, R. M., *Commentary on Livy* I-V, Oxford, 1965.
RE	*Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Pauly - Wissowa).
Sommer	Sommer, F., *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg, repr. 1948.
Wackernagel	Wackernagel, J., *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel, 1924.
Walbank	Walbank, F. W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Oxford, vol. I, 1957, vol. II, 1967.

References to periodicals are in line with those given in *L'Année Philologique*. Sallust's works are referred to as *BC*, *BJ*, and *Hist.* Fragments of the *Historiae* are quoted according to the edition of Maurenbrecher (M).

INTRODUCTION

1. *Life of Sallust*

In spite of the fact that Sallust's life and writings aroused a wide variety of comment in the ancient world, surprisingly little reliable information exists for much of his career. It is now generally accepted that C. Sallustius Crispus was born at Amiternum in the Sabine land, about fifty miles north-east of Rome, in 86 B.C. and died in 35 B.C., four years before the Battle of Actium.

Our chief source for Sallust's dates is the *Chronicle* of Jerome. If one follows the best MS (O) and equates the different eras correctly the evidence provided by Jerome reads:

(i) *Sallustius Crispus scriptor historicus in Sabinis Amiterni nascitur*: *ann. Abr.* 1931 = *Ol.* 173. 3/4 = *A.U.C.* 669 = 85 B.C.
(ii) *Sallustius diem obiit quadriennio ante Actiacum bellum*: *ann. Abr.* 1981 = *Ol.* 186.1/2 = *A.U.C.* 719 = 35 B.C.

Scholars have interpreted the data provided by Jerome and the conflicting evidence of the *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 347, 359 Dindorf) and of the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* 1.214, 217) to produce the dates 86 and 35 (e.g. G. Funaioli, *RE* I A. 1914; R. Helm, *Philologus*, Suppl. 21, 2 (1929) 39f.) More recently, G. Perl, *Klio* 48 (1967) 97ff., by a new interpretation of the term *quadriennium* has posited the date of death as 34 B.C., a date assumed by J. C. Rolfe, *Oxford Class. Dict.*, ed. 1, 1948 and already proposed by E. Bikermann, *REL* 24 (1946) 148, n.1. There is no absolute certainty about the standard dates, since Jerome can be convicted of carelessness and inaccuracy in other particulars of literary history (cf. Syme, 13f.).

If scholars have difficulty with fairly abundant though conflicting evidence for dates of birth and death, the case is even more desperate when it comes to attempts to reconstruct the details of Sallust's infancy, boyhood, education, political training and beliefs, and public career. "Nothing, it must be repeated, can be recovered of Sallust's career and vicissitudes before he stood for the tribunate in the summer of 53" (Syme, 28). In the face of this complete lack of evidence one can merely surmise that well-attested external factors could and might have had influence both on Sallust's career and on his point of view as a writer.

One of the most important of these external factors is the municipal origin of Sallust. Most of the Sabine communities, Amiternum among them, were fully enfranchised before the Social War (L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* 66, 82ff.) and by the historian's time those ennobled by office at Amiternum, including almost certainly the Sallustii, would have been thoroughly Romanized (Earl, *Historia* 15 (1966) 302ff.). Men of municipal origin must have formed a steadily growing section of the Senate from the beginning of the first century; in the Senate, as enlarged by Caesar, they comprised half of the membership (Syme, *P.B.S.R.* 14 (1938) 1ff., *Roman Revolution* ch. 6; T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Oxford, 1971, 8). Nor is the historian the only Sallustius known at Rome at this time. One of the best documented of these is Cicero's friend Cn. Sallustius (*Att.* 1.3.3, 1.11.1, 11.11.2, 11.17a.1, 11.20.2, 13.50.4, *Fam.* 14.4.6, 14.11, *Q.Fr.* 3.4.2-3, 3.5/6.1, *Div.* 1.59). For other possible Sallustii see Syme, 10f.; Earl, *op. cit.* 305.

Other external factors which must have had influence on Sallust's career and viewpoint are the effect on the Italian municipia of the Social War; the civil war which led to the dictatorship and proscriptions of Sulla; the fact that Sallust's youth and manhood were passed under the system of oligarchy which Sulla restored; the turbulence and intrigues of the middle sixties; the return of Pompeius Magnus from the East, and the consulship of Julius Caesar.

We know nothing of Sallust's activity in the sixties. His statement that he came early to desire a political career (*BC* 3.3) is too vague to be of use; Earl's theory (*op. cit.* 302ff.) that he was, like his contemporaries, on military service before his accession to public office is attractive, but in the absence of direct evidence such a theory can only be conjectural. The *Invectiva in Sallustium* maintains that Sallust spent his youth in wild dissipation. Specific charges, such as being a member of a secret Pythagorean society (*Inv. in Sall.* 14) where he would take part in strange cult rites, including the sacrifice of boys (cf. Cicero, *in Vat.* 14); accusations of adultery with Milo's wife (Varro apud Gell.17.18) or with other matrons of Rome are imputations which were practically obligatory in the political invective of the period. Many of the charges, moreover, do not stand up well to examination (Syme, 278ff.).

If 86 is the true date of Sallust's birth he could have been quaestor

in 55 in the second consulship of Pompeius and Crassus. The sole authority for supposing that Sallust was quaestor is the *Invectiva in Sallustium* 5.15, a product of the imperial schools of rhetoric and ascribed (Diomedes, 1.387.4K) to a certain Didius; there is no direct attestation for the quaestorship (Broughton, *MRR* 2.217). Sallust's first attested office was the tribunate of 52. While it is to be conceded that membership of the Senate could have come with the tribunate (Syme, 28; Earl, *op. cit.* 306), the theory that Sallust was never quaestor is improbable. This does not follow from the fact that the only positive evidence for it is unreliable. The quaestorship was the normal first step in a public career, so that its omission in any particular case demands specific negative evidence.

The evidence for Sallust's tribunate (Asconius 37, 44-45, 49C) also gives some hint at his possible political allegiance at that time, and helps to combat a common assumption that Sallust was from first to last a partisan of Caesar. The year 52 opened without consuls, but three candidates were in the field. The Optimates supported T. Annius Milo; Pompeius' candidates were Q. Metellus Scipio and P. Plautius Hypsaeus, who were also strongly supported by P. Clodius then a candidate for the praetorship. Asconius (33-52C *passim*) names the tribunes Pompeius Rufus and Munatius Plancus as active in hostility to Milo and Cicero and as chief inciters to riot and arson after the murder of Clodius. In addition, Asconius (37, 49, 51C) names Sallust as active in support of his fellow tribune Pompeius Rufus and as cooperating with Plancus (37, 44, 51C). It could be surmised from this that Sallust was on the side of Clodius and Pompeius (Syme, 31f. Earl, *op. cit.*, 310). All three were certainly opposed to Milo, but Sallust's opposition to him is not attested before Clodius' death, and he was allegedly reconciled to him later (Asconius 37C). Roman politics often placed ill-assorted people temporarily on the same side (e.g. Pompeius and Clodius) and there is nothing to show what Sallust's motives in 52 were. His transference to the camp of Caesar is to be accounted for by the vicissitudes of political intrigue. One should perhaps mention in this context Sallust's expulsion from the Senate in 50 (Cassius Dio, 40.63.4) and the widely known fact that Caesar was prepared to accept allies without question (Syme, *Roman Revolution* 66-67, *Sallust* 35). Expulsion from the Senate was normally justified by reasons or pretexts of public or private misbehaviour. Cassius Dio

gives no hint of such allegations against Sallust. The censorship was used as a weapon in party strife and Sallust may have thus paid the penalty for actions and attitudes during his tribunate. See further Syme, 33ff. Whatever the reason, expulsion from the Senate represented a severe setback to his career and is probably alluded to in '*multa mihi advorsa fuere*' of *BC* 3.3.

Sallust is next heard of as commanding one of Caesar's legions in Illyricum late in 49 and failing to stave off the capitulation of the Caesarians under C. Antonius on the island of Curicta (Orosius, 6.15.8). For nearly two years there is no mention of him in history. He re-emerges in 47, when as praetor-elect (Broughton *TAPhA* 79 (1948) 76ff.) he is reported to have failed in a mission to quell a mutiny among the Caesarian troops in Campania, troops awaiting the invasion of Africa (Appian, *BC* 2.92; Cassius Dio, 42.52. 1-2).

As praetor in 46, Sallust was active in Caesar's African campaign where he demonstrated his administrative and executive ability in securing much needed supplies from the island of Cercina (*Bell. Afr.* 8.3, 34.1, 34.3). He was rewarded in singular fashion. After the battle of Thapsus Caesar took the greater part of Numidia away from King Juba and turned it into a Roman province, Africa Nova; Sallust was appointed its first governor with the rank of proconsul (*Bell. Afr.* 97.1; Appian, *BC* 2.100; Cassius Dio, 43.9.2). Since he received proconsular *imperium* early in June Sallust must have been *praetor pro consule* for the remainder of the year—an appointment noteworthy because of its comparative rarity in the Republican period (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 2.647-650). His re-admission to the Senate was a consequence of this praetorship.

According to Cassius Dio (43.9.2) Sallust so misgoverned his province that he had to face charges of extortion on his return to Rome. These charges were not pressed, and Dio's report (43.47.4) that the suppression of bribery charges in 45 B.C. were due to bribes paid to Caesar for this indulgence suggests that this may have been the case with Sallust (cf. *Inv. in Sall.* 19; E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Prinzipat des Pompeius* (1922) 424; W. Allen jr., *Stud. in Phil.* 51 (1954) 7f.). Whatever the truth of these charges and stratagems it is clear that Sallust was spared the humiliation of a second expulsion from the Senate and retained riches vast enough to enable him to maintain a house and grounds

(the latter to become famous in imperial times as the *Horti Sallustiani*) on a palatial scale. It is also clear that somehow he secured a highly favoured and very strong position in his later years, since he both survived the proscriptions unscathed and wrote with remarkable outspokeness on the pernicious effects of *potentia paucorum*. While it is impossible to say with certainty what effect the assassination of Caesar in 44 had on Sallust, it is probable that it confirmed his resolve to abandon political ambition and devote himself to literary pursuits—*a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui . . . perscribere* (*BC* 4.2).

Apart from his writings which occupied the final years of his life, nothing is known for certain concerning Sallust down to his death in 35 B.C. In spite of the acceptance by reputable scholars, e.g. E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie*, 164; L. Pareti, *La congiura di Catilina* (1934) 204, of the assertion by Jerome (*Adv. Iovinianum*, 1.48) that Sallust married Cicero's divorced wife, Terentia, this engaging suggestion should be dismissed as a fabrication. On the historian's death, a grandson of his sister inherited the name through adoption (Tactitus, *Ann.*3.30.1).

2. *The Writings of Sallust*

Three historical works are ascribed without dispute to Sallust. Two of these we possess complete, the monographs *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Jugurthinum*; of his third and main work, the *Historiae*, we possess only fragments, four orations and two letters, excerpted from the main work and transmitted in a separate edition with the speeches from the monographs, and about five hundred smaller fragments. These reveal a structural organisation into five Books, the last of which, from internal evidence, is manifestly incomplete and we may fairly assume that the author died before he could bring his narrative down to the termination he had planned for it. As it exists, the *Historiae* indicates a treatment of the years 78-67 B.C.; the arrangement of the fragments by B. Maurenbrecher (*C. Sallusti Crispi Reliquiae*: I. *Prolegomena* (1891); II. *Fragmenta* (1893) is generally accepted, though modifications are occasionally proposed (e.g. Bloch, *Didascaliae*, Studies Albareda (1961) 61ff.).

There is less agreement about the other works which are sometimes ascribed to Sallust. Scholars have long been occupied with the question of the genuineness of the two *Epistulae ad Caesarem senem*,

which are transmitted in a manuscript (V) along with the letters and speeches from the historical works. Copious literary, linguistic and historical arguments have been adduced both for and against the authenticity of these works. The present state of the question seems to be that many Continental scholars (e.g. Büchner, Egermann, Funaioli, Sangiacomo, Skard, Steidle, Vretska) are strongly in support of Sallustian authorship for the *Epistulae* and some even include the far more dubious *Invectiva in Ciceronem* as part of the Sallustian *corpus*. Some Continental scholars (e.g. Dihle, Fuchs, Jachmann, Latte), Fraenkel and most British scholars remain unconvinced. On this topic of authenticity see especially Syme, 314ff., Appendix II, "The False Sallust" and the bibliography cited there. His refutation of arguments for authenticity based on such criteria as language and style, personality of author, historical context is wholly convincing. Consequently citation of these *spuria* in the Commentary is used only to illustrate matters of thought or style; the passages have little intrinsic value and are of far less interest than echoes of Sallust in Tacitus or Velleius Paterculus.

3. *The Bellum Catilinae*

(i) *Date*: Indications as to the date of publication of Sallust's first monograph are few and very general in character. Sallust's attitude to Caesar and Cato in ch.54 and the word *fuere* in 53, 6 show that both Caesar and Cato were dead, which provides us with a *terminus post quem* of 44 B.C. The date of death, 35 B.C., gives us a *terminus ante quem*. Otherwise we have merely the relative dating which places the *Bellum Catilinae* probably earlier than the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and both of these works earlier than the *Historiae*. The statements of *BC*, ch. 4 seem to imply that his treatment of the Catilinarian conspiracy was Sallust's first work; the words of *BJ* 95, 2: *alio loco de Sullae rebus dicturi sumus*, may refer to a contemplated work, the *Historiae*. The lack of precise indication has given scope for scholars to indulge their theories and to make the date fit in with what they conceived to be the purpose of the monograph. L. Wohleb, *Phil. Woch.* 48 (1928), 1242ff., interpreting the tone of the prologues of both monographs, claims that the *Bellum Catilinae* was begun before the death of Caesar and finished during Cicero's lifetime and that the *Bellum Jugurthinum* was written when the Second Triumvirate was imminent but not yet established, i.e. before November 43 B.C. Both O. Gebhardt,

Sallust als politischer Publizist während des Bürgerkrieges, Diss. Halle, 1920, 20 and Büchner, 109 postulate completion before the death of Cicero. The Schwartz thesis that the first monograph was a response to Cicero's *de Consiliis Suis* would imply that it was written under the Second Triumvirate; Cicero's ἀνέκδοτον (*Att.* 2.6.2, 14.17.6; Cassius Dio, 39.10.1-3; Plutarch, *Crass.* 13.2-3), a secret history not published until after Cicero's death, was a denunciation of Crassus and Caesar. An extreme formulation of Schwartz's thesis is that of A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur römischen Geschichte* (1921) 174f., who asserts that Sallust's work was commissioned in 42 by Octavianus to combat the influence of *de Consiliis*; somewhat similar is the thesis of M. Büdinger, *SBAkW*, Wien, 123 (1891), 20ff., who held that Sallust was induced to write his monograph because the deeds of the Triumvirs so resembled Catiline's programme. H. M. Last, *Mélanges Marouzeau* (1948) 360, maintaining that the work was made available to a world still under the shadow of the dictator's death, presumes publication at the latest soon after the beginning of 42. Besides appealing to the contemporary situation, attempts to settle on a plausible dating also adduce changes and development in the opinions of the author, in particular more maturity, more confidence and sharper comment in the prologue of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*. None of these arguments is completely compelling. Syme (128f.) accepts the view of G. Boissier, *La conjuration de Catilina* (1905), 10, that the work was probably begun in 42 and not finished before 41. Any precise dating remains, ultimately, unattainable.

(ii) *Sources*: Sources for the facts upon which Sallust bases his account of Catiline's conspiracy were especially abundant. But there is no clear indication given by Sallust as to the authorities he followed, and even more than most ancient historians he is extremely reticent about his literary obligations.

That he relied to some extent on the memories of living men is indicated by his reporting of rumours current at the time, details which he himself is not prepared to vouch for (see on 14.7, 17.7, 19.4, 22.1, 48.7). Sallust had known many of the leading figures; in 48.9 he quotes an assertion of Crassus, he had close contact with P. Sulla, who had commanded Caesar's right wing at Pharsalia and who died at the end of 46. Men who had either played a part in the conspiracy or were intimately connected with those that had

participated survived the Civil War, e.g. C. Antonius, Messala Rufus, close friend of P. Sulla, L. Calpurnius Bestia, tribune of the plebs in 62. Above all, Sallust had contact with the most intelligent man of the age, the literary and cultivated Caesar.

Documents were also available—published speeches such as those of Cicero (on Cato's see Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 23; *Cic.* 21); records of the proceedings of the Senate (cf. Cicero, *pro Sulla* 42); memoirs of public men of the period; letters which outlived their writers. Sallust does indeed present documents of a kind—a letter from Manlius to Marcius Rex (ch. 33) which Sallust implies is not an exact copy of the original; a letter from Catiline to Catulus (ch. 35) and one from Lentulus to Catiline (44.5), both introduced with the word *exemplum*, the second also available in another version by Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.12), and both, therefore, probably genuine.

But Sallust's main source was probably the writings of Cicero. Extant works which contain material of interest and of immediate relevance are the four orations against Catiline which, together with eight other speeches delivered in 63, were prepared by Cicero for publication in 60 (*Att.* 2.1.3); the speech *in Toga Candida*, delivered a few days before the elections in 64 and preserved in fragmentary form by Asconius (82-94C); the speech in defence of Licinius Murena in November 63 and the *pro Sulla* of the following year. We cannot, unfortunately, measure the value of works by Cicero which are no longer extant or which, like his Latin poem *de Consulatu Suo*, are preserved in fragments too meagre to be of use (*HRR* 2.xvi). They include verse eulogies of his consulship in Greek (*Att.* 2.1.3) and Latin (*Att.* 1.19.10); the explosive *de Consiliis Suis* (cf. p. 7); the poem *de Temporibus Suis* (*Fam.* i.9.23, *Q. Fr.* 2.16.4 etc.; the Ἡρακλείδειον *aliquid* (*Att.* 15.4.3, 15.27.2) which was probably a discussion of Caesar's assassination; a history of his times (Cassius Dio, 46.21; Plutarch, *Cic.* 41). See further K. Büchner in *RE* VIIA.1245, 1250, 1267. Finally, one should not overlook works concerning Cato, viz. Brutus' *Cato* (*Att.* 13.46.2), Cicero's *Laus Catonis* (*ibid.*), Caesar's *Anticato* (*Att.* 12.40.1).

Concerning this apparent abundance of source material it should be noted that while Cicero's material was undoubtedly useful, it was also singularly one-sided. What Sallust needed was diversity of source material and it is doubtful whether he had it—the likelihood of anyone having written or spoken well of Catiline is very remote. Sallust incorporates without question the elements of ex-

aggeration and propaganda which impregnated the speeches of Cicero and the portrait which emerges of the man and his activity is a hostile one. The story as presented in the sources has provoked through the centuries a flood of literature, either accepting the picture of Catiline as a born conspirator or defending him as one of Rome's few genuine reformers, champion of a new social order; from other viewpoints Catiline is presented as the instrument of leading political figures or as the precursor of Julius Caesar, a man aiming at dictatorial power. See Z. Yavetz, *Historia* 12 (1963) 485-87. Consideration must be given to the bias of the sources, but it is no solution to aver that the conspiracy was largely a figment of Cicero's imagination, an affair invented for his own Machiavellian purposes (e.g. K. H. Waters, *Historia* 19 (1970) 195ff.). The composition and aims of the conspiracy, the social and economic problems that called it forth, the reaction of leading men in the state to the threat it posed cannot simply be dismissed as non-events.

The monograph form involves more than a mere reporting of events. It gives room for analysis of character and event, and, in Sallust's case, for the casting and shaping of both motive and action into the framework of a moral viewpoint. This aspect is particularly apparent in the long introduction with which he prefaces his account (Appendix I) and in the speeches which form an important element of his narrative. Such a treatment involves ideas and expressions which go back ultimately to the writings of the Greek philosophers and orators who dealt with the theme of man and the state, and a familiarity with the Latin writers who had dealt with the theme of Roman greatness in terms congenial to the point of view which Sallust had adopted. The Commentary, in sections such as those mentioned, shows clearly that Sallust was familiar with the writings of Plato, Posidonius, Demosthenes, Xenophon, Thucydides and others among the Greeks, and that like most Romans of his class his knowledge of the great Latin writers who preceded him, notably Ennius and Cato, was profound.

(iii) *Form and Structure*: Sallust's deliberate choice of the monograph form for his first two historical works (*statui res gestas populi Romani carptim . . . perscribere—BC* 4.2) involves two points of importance in any consideration of his work. Firstly it indicates a rejection of the alternative forms of writing history which were open to him from the Roman theory and practice of his period; secondly his choice of form had a profound effect, one

which is sometimes overlooked, both on the style and structure of his works. Our remarks on these features are here, naturally, confined to the *Bellum Catilinae*.

The bulk of Roman history-writing prior to Sallust is represented by the work of the annalists. General Roman opinion concerning this is probably reflected in the verdict of Cicero (*de Orat.* 2.51ff.) that history was a mere compilation of annals (*annalium confectio*) which demanded no prose style and whose chief claims to admiration were accuracy and brevity. Cato, Fabius Pictor and Piso are cited as examples. Other forms of history-writing—e.g. outline history (Atticus, Velleius, Florus) and memoirs (Rutilius, Sulla)—would not loom large in Sallust's thinking. He was, however, undoubtedly influenced by the work of such writers as Licinius Macer, who died in 66 and had written on the early Republic, incorporating into his narrative, by his vicious attacks on the aristocracy, the conflicts of his own life and times (*HRR* I. CCCXLVIII ff.; F. Münzer, *RE* XIII.419ff.) and above all by Cornelius Sisenna (*HRR* I. CCCXXXIV ff.; cf. E. Badian, *JRS* 52 (1962) 50f.). Sisenna who died in 67 also chose contemporary history and is credited by Sallust as doing so *optume et diligentissume omnium* (*BJ* 95.2); of all the predecessors he is the historian most akin to Sallust. By contemporary Roman standards Macer is censured for *loquacitas* and Sisenna, although acknowledged as the best historian to date, is yet only credited with an achievement described as *puerile quiddam*, in that he simply imitates the Greek Clitarchus. To raise Roman historiography to the level attained by the Greeks a higher form of composition is needed (*Leg.* 1.55ff.). Instead of the dry and factual listing of the annalists, of the diffuseness of contemporary historiography with its importation of the poetic, the archaic and the unusual in style and language, what was needed was the type of prose composition practised by an orator of the first rank—*genus orationis fusum atque tractatum et cum lenitate quadam aequaliter profluens* (*de Orat.* 2.64; cf. *Orat.* 66). Sallust rejected all three. See A. H. McDonald, *JRS* 65 (1975) 46ff.

His decision to write a monograph rather than annals is not, however, a complete break with tradition. See L. Canfora, "Il programma di Sallustio", *Belfagor* 27 (1972) 137ff. The form had already been domesticated in Roman historiography by Coelius Antipater, who received somewhat grudging praise from Cicero (*de Orat.* 2.54, *Leg.* 1.6). To cope with the demands of this form

which should ideally (cf. Cicero's letter to Lucceius, *Fam.* 5.12) embody drama, colour, concentration on a leading personality caught up in the vicissitudes of a highly-charged political situation, Sallust forged a style of his own. In doing so he avoided the Hellenistic vein of historiography which also places personality at the centre of events, but embellishes its narrative with the vivid portrayal of pathos, horror, the erotic and the supernatural, with its inclusion of dreams, oracles and omens. The style framed by Sallust was one which incorporated some of the elements traditional in Roman historiography, but which also used in its formulation the practice and example of writers hitherto ignored by Roman historians, in particular Thucydides and Cato the elder, and which ultimately and inevitably reflects the influence of his own complex personality and experience.

The influence on Sallust of the great Greek historian, Thucydides, is palpable and pervasive. Velleius Paterculus (2.30.2) calls Sallust *aemulus Thucydidis.* They share the same basic view of human nature and agree in the way in which they considered history should be written—a method involving concentration, selection, omission, with an emphasis on politics and analyses of human behaviour within this field. In particular, the Thucydidean influence is reflected in the structure and style of the *Bellum Catilinae.*

Scholarly treatments of the structure of this monograph reach no unanimity concerning the sections into which the work should be divided nor concerning the connection between the sections so distinguished. The most important of these treatments are R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig, 1906, 84-9; R. Ullmann, *Rev. phil.* 42 (1918) 5ff.; K. Latte, *NWzA*, 2R.H4, Leipzig, 1935, 30ff.; K. Bauhofer, *Die Komposition der Historien Sallusts,* Diss. München, 1935, 45ff.; K. Vretska, "Der Aufbau des Bellum Catilinae", *Hermes* 72 (1937) 202-222; K. Büchner, *Sallust,* Heidelberg, 1960; W. Steidle, *Historia,* Einzelschrift 3 (1958) 1ff.; F. Giancotti, *Strutture delle monografie di Sallustio e di Tacito,* Messina d'Anna, 1971.

I have not hesitated, therefore, to construct this Commentary on what I consider to be a straightforward division of the monograph into reasonably coherent sections. An analysis of the structure I have assumed can be presented as follows:

1.1.—4.5. Prologue
  1.1—4.2 justification of author's decision to write history;

4.3—4.4	announcement and justification of choice of subject;
4.5	transitional;
5.1—5.8	Character-sketch of Catiline.
5.9	General justification for excursus on Roman history.
6.1—13.5	Excursus on Roman History
6.—9.5	the rise of Rome.
10.1—13.5	the decline of Rome.
14.1—16.5	Catiline's associates.
17.1—7	First meeting of the conspirators.
18.1—19.6	Digression—the First Catilinarian Conspiracy.
20.1—22.3	The first speech of Catiline and its effects.
23.1—26.5	Activity between June 64 and the elections in the summer of 63.
	ch. 25 Digression—portrait of Sempronia.
27.1—36.3	The progress of the conspiracy down to the flight of Catiline.
36.4—39.5	Description of the current political situation in Rome.
39.6—47.4	The Allobroges and the conspiracy.
48.1—55.6	The suppression of the conspiracy in Rome.
51.1—52.36	the debate of December 5.
53.1—54.6	Caesar and Cato compared.
56.1—61.9	The end of the conspiracy.
	ch. 58 The second speech of Catiline.

Irrespective of what precision of sectioning one may aim at in analysing the structure of the *Bellum Catilinae* one important aspect of Latin historiography should be borne in mind. From Greek historiography it inherited the view that the task of the historian was to narrate and explain events, and the explanation was fundamentally to be given in terms of the character of those who participated in those events. Sempronius Asellio (c. 125 B.C.) shows his grasp of this distinguishing feature of real history as against the mere compilation of facts represented by *annales* in his words: *Nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam, quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent, demonstrare* (apud Gell. 5.18.8). A historian is forced to make a selection of events; this selection will inevitably be influenced by his view of the nature of the explanation required. Herein lies Sallust's excuse for his long moralising introduction, his decision to include portraits of Catiline, and of Sempronia, and the famous comparison of Caesar

and Cato, his inclusion of such digressions as the First Catilinarian Conspiracy (chs. 18-19), his manner of underlining and explaining events by means of speeches, the explanatory function of which is deepened by the incorporation of gnomic generalisations. Herein, too, lies the explanation for the apparent neglect of social and economic problems, the omission of or the re-arrangement of incident and background material. The commentary on the various sections mentioned above will further elucidate the points made in general terms here. See in particular the excursus "The Roman view of historical explanation" in G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman poetry*, Oxford, 1968, 619ff.

Such a view of the historian's task, viz. that selection of material and the emphasis given to character and event is dictated by the historian's own view of the underlying significance of his material, is basically the legacy of Thucydides, who laid down the principle that historical events ultimately depend on human nature and that events in the future will bear a varying degree of similarity to events in the past because of this constant factor (1.22.4). Hence the utility of historiography. Thucydides' influence on Sallust, as already noted, is very marked. Speaking in more concrete terms about structure one could say that the speeches in the *Bellum Catilinae*, both in their arrangement and content, owe much to the practice of Thucydides and that digressions such as the treatment of the First Conspiracy and the comparison of Caesar and Cato are inspired by digressions such as that on Peisistratus in Thucydides 6.54-59 and the treatment of Pausanias/Themistocles in 1.128-138.

(iv) *Style*: The Thucydidean influence is also evident in Sallust's style. Ancient critics were struck in particular by the fact that Thucydides deliberately fashioned a style of his own, a style which is marked by poetical language, variety of grammatical usage, inconcinnity, rapidity (Dion. Hal., *De Thuc.* 24). Sallust shows resemblances in the devices he adopted in forging his own style—a selective vocabulary involving poetical and archaic words, unusual grammatical turns, inconcinnity, rapidity of thought and expression entailing compression and omission. The Latin style he produced must also in part be ascribed to the influence of Cato, who provided not only the high moral outlook and veneration for old Roman virtues which coincided with Sallust's own viewpoint, but also the elements of an old-fashioned Latin style. These various elements

are fused into a structure of which the prominent feature is antithesis, a form of expression which may well reflect the personality of the writer.

The comments of ancient critics, who were quick to note that Sallust's language and syntax differ conspicuously from those of contemporary prose, tend to concentrate on specific aspects of this new style. The feature which drew most attention was his *brevitas* and a related element of abruptness, described as *abruptum sermonis genus* by Quintilian (4.2.25); Gellius (3.1.6) describes the author as *subtilissimus brevitatis artifex*; Seneca the elder comments on this feature: *nihil demi sine detrimento sensus potest* (*Contr.* 9.1.13) and the younger Seneca talks of *amputatae sententiae et verba ante expectatum cadentia* (*Ep.* 114.17), noting both the brevity and the abruptness of the Sallustian sentence, his avoidance, in general, of the periodic structure of his era. Sentence structure in Sallust is characterised by a striving after *variatio*, the product of which is commonly *inconcinnitas*. It is marked by the employment of such devices as asyndeton, parataxis, hyperbaton, chiasmus, either separately or in combination.

Asyndeton of three or more words is a common feature, e.g. 3.3 *audacia largitia avaritia*; cf. 9.2, 11.2, 11.6, 14.2, 16.2, 21.2, 54.4, 59.5. It tends to occur where an especially forcible description is looked for. It can be a matter of synonyms, e.g. 59.5 *appellat hortatur rogat*, or a repetition of slogans (e.g. 11.2) which thereby embraces the whole range of the concept under consideration. The individual constituents of such slogan groups are usually well established in the work and recur again and again. In such combinations it is the totality rather than the separate ingredients which, is important. Asyndetic lists, the first pair of words without copula, the second with *atque*, are of frequent occurrence, often combined with chiasmus, e.g. 6.1, 10.2, 12.2, 20.7, 51.1, 52.3.

Sallust uses various types of parataxis to avoid a periodic structure. Thus at 2.1 we have an explanatory clause rendered by means of a parenthesis introduced by *nam*. Only one other such example is to be found in this monograph, at 47.4 (parenthesis without *nam* at 30.4) but it occurs more frequently in *Bell. Jug.* e.g. 12.3, 37.4, 90.1. The use of *nam*, as of *sed*, is one of the prominent features of Sallustian style. For details see R. M. Frazer, *CPh.* 56 (1961) 251-252. At 3.3 *ibique* illustrates parataxis by the use of copulative particles, cf. 5.2, 20.1 (*atque ibi*), while at 7.3 we have

tanta cupido gloriae incesserat (cf. 36.5, *BJ* 84.3), the use of an explanatory principal clause instead of a subordinate causal clause. Very similar to this is *epiphonema*, the use of an exclamatory concluding clause, e.g. 7.5 *virtus omnia domuerat*, while the omission of the causal conjunction in such sentences as 39.4 *neque illis . . . licuisset*, produces a like result. Parataxis by change of construction is also frequent. Thus at 5.2 with *huic fuere . . . ibique . . . exercuit* there occurs a change of subject, a feature repeated at 5.6 *hunc . . . invaserat . . . quicuqam pensi habebat*. At 16.2 *confisus . . . simul quod . . . et quod* we have change of construction involving a participle and a causal clause; cf. 40.1, *BJ* 25.5, 43.5, 100.4. At 8.1 *ea* occurs an example of his practice of repetition of subject by means of *is, ea, id*; cf. 12.5 (*id demum*), 14.3 (*ii*), 20.4 (*ea demum*), 37.4 (*ea vero*), 58.16, *BJ* 63.7 etc. The pronoun is generally accompanied by *demum* or *vero*. Hyperbaton, inversion of the customary or expected order of words or phrases, is used to add emphasis to a word or concept. Thus at 6.7 *eo modo . . . animum humanum* emphasis is given to *immutato more*; at 20.14 *libertas* is similarly emphasised; cf. 8.5, 17.5, 20.14. This effect is also achieved by the use of asyndetic *sententiae* such as 52.4 *capta urbe nihil fit reliqui victis*, involving omission of *nam* or *sed*; cf. 51.3, 52.6, 52.18, 52.29, 58.14, *BJ* 10.4, 85.43. Chiasmus, "a conscious element of his style" (R. B. Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, Caesar, Tacitus and Justinus*, Diss. Baltimore 1892) is illustrated at 5.4 *satis eloquentiae sapientiae parum*. Sometimes it seems to be used to avoid a rhyming effect, as above; cf. also 10.6, 20.13, 58.1. Asyndetic lists are often arranged in chiastic form, e.g. 6.1, 10.2, 15.5, 20.7, 59.5, 61.9, while in other lists the element of chiasmus is only just avoided, e.g. 12.2, 51.1, 52.3, 52.14.

The *inconcinnitas* of Sallust's sentence structure shows itself particularly in his reluctance to give corresponding parts of sentences a similar formulation. The triple form of the object of *disserere* at 5.9 is a notable example of his fondness for variety of construction, a feature which is most evident in his use of introductory words like *pars . . . alii* (e.g. 2.1). It manifests itself also in a variation in the use of connective particles, e.g. *non . . . aut . . . neque . . . neque* at 13.3; cf. *BJ* 18.2, 72.2, 85.23, *Hist.* 1.136M. In 14.2 Sallust produces for the first time a close approximation of the more normal periodic structure of his time, but his use of a variety of *copulae* (*quicumque . . . quique . . . praeterea*

... *ad hoc*) still reflects the somewhat jerky style he affected. A similar construction marks his listings in 17.3-5, 37.5. Elsewhere he uses *praeterea* many times (e.g. 40.6, 58.8) *item* (27.4), *simul* (e.g. 19.2) and especially *ad hoc* (e.g. 30.6) to avoid a compactness of periodic structure by the technique of an apparent afterthought, which gives the impression that the author had not properly worked out his thought when he began his sentence and was forced, as it were, to append an addendum. His occasional preference for the uncommon positioning of the attributive adjective in such expressions as *alienum aes grande* (14.2), *designati consules* (18.2), *homo novus* (23.6) has also been taken as part of his *inconcinnitas*, a deliberate attempt to jolt his readers, accustomed to time-honoured phrasing. In some cases, however, the change of position of the attribute can be accounted for by the presence of a second adjective. See notes on the above passages. This feature also extends itself to the deliberate avoidance of traditional terminology, e.g. 55.1 *tresviros* for *triumviri* (*capitales*) and 55.5 *vindices rerum capitalium* for *triumviri r.c.*

The pursuit of *variatio* frequently involves *constructio ad sensum*. Thus introductory *pars* is often connected with masculine adjectives (e.g. *pars edocti, BJ* 66.4) and plural verbs (e.g. *pars ... certabant, BC* 38.3). At 5.7 *quae utraque* illustrates the employment of a neuter pronoun to refer back to nouns which are masculine or feminine; cf. 3.4, 10.3, 31.1, *BJ* 41.3, 85.30. At 7.4 with *iuventus, simul ac ... erat ... discebat ... habebant* there occurs variation in the number of the verb with a collective noun; cf. 23.6, 56.5; variation in the number of the relative pronoun with a collective noun is illustrated at 56.5. Such *constructiones ad sensum* are common in both Greek and Latin and belong to all periods. Their special frequency in both Thucydides and Sallust has led Perrochat (28f.) to conclude that Sallust was here influenced in particular by Thucydides. This view is shared by Latte, *NWzA* 2R.H4 Leipzig, 1935, 16 and by J. Robolski, *Sallustius in conformanda oratione* etc., Diss. Halle, 1881.

Besides the use of asyndeton, Sallust's *brevitas* also includes his ellipses, particularly his omission of the verb *sum* (see on *putare*, 2.2), occasional brachylogy such as *supra ea*, 3.2, and his use of polar expressions to convey the whole range of a concept by mentioning its outermost limits, e.g. 11.3 *neque copia neque inopia*; cf. 11.6, 15.4, 20.7, 30.4, 52.32. Compression of thought also occurs;

see, e.g. on 3.2 *quae delicta reprehenderis malevolentia et invidia dicta putant*; 3.5 *eadem quae ceteros fama*; 23.4 *quae quoque modo.* The effect of these practices, described by Quintilian (10.1.102) as *immortalem illam Sallustii velocitatem* (cf. *id.* 10.1.32; Statius, *Silv.* 4.7.55; Sidon. Apoll. *Carm.* 2.190, 23.152; Apuleius, *Apol.* 95; Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.1.7) provides the same air of breathlessness, of hastening on to more important things such as is implied, also by Quintilian (10.1.73), of Thucydides, who is described as *densus et brevis et semper instans sibi.*

Also connected with *brevitas* is a feature which underlies both the structure and the style of the monograph. The opening segment of the *Bellum Catilinae* (1.1—1.4) introduces us to the device of antithesis which controls the elements of the shortest sentences and governs the disposition of larger segments in relation to each other. The importance of antithesis in Sallust's mode of expression is most clearly exemplified in the excursus on Roman history, chs. 6-13. This excursus falls into two antithetically connected halves—chs. 6-9 and chs. 10-13. The arrangement by antithesis enables Sallust to leave much actually unsaid. Thus the ideal behaviour of the ancients is always understood to be in contrast to contemporary vileness, and an awareness of the contemporary scene in its turn keeps the picture of the past from being simply an idealization. In the narrative of the conspiracy antithesis also plays its part. Thus the description of the activity of the conspirators prior to the elections of 63 (chs. 23-26) is organised on the antithesis between the activity of Catiline and that of the rest of the conspirators, while in the following narrative, dealing with the progress of the conspiracy in Rome (chs. 27-36.3) the antithesis continues with the contrast between the actions of Catiline and those of Cicero. Antithesis similarly governs the structure of ch. 46.

An unmistakable feature of Sallust's style is his archaism. Asinius Pollio reports that Sallust employed Ateius Philologus to collect *antiqua verba et figuras* for his use (Suetonius, *De gramm.* 10), and he was accused of looting the elder Cato's writings (Suetonius, *De gramm.* 15; *Aug.* 86). The Catonian influence on Sallust in matters of vocabulary is clear and it is often annotated in the Commentary below. Sallust's rejection of earlier forms of historical composition did not include the discarding of all features of these writings. The writer of history before Sallust exhibited well-marked deviations from standard prose, especially in the use of poetical

and archaic words and constructions (see on Sisenna, p. 10). In this case, archaism of forms and vocabulary might, perhaps, be explained partly as a wish to reproduce the flavour of the past which they revered, partly as a conscious or unconscious imitation of the language of ancient documents. Sallust's reasons for adhering to this practice when dealing with events which were almost contemporary cannot be explained exactly in the same way. Archaism happened to be one of the devices he employed in the forging of a style which represented a deliberate disowning of the prose style to which his readers were accustomed.

Archaism manifests itself in Sallust in the fields of vocabulary and construction. As far as vocabulary is concerned it is often impossible to distinguish between the archaic, the colloquial and the poetic, but in discussing the archaic in Sallust's vocabulary one should include (a) words avoided by writers like Cicero and Caesar or used by them in a different sense, e.g. *tempestas* (7.1), *necessitudo* (17.2), *facundia* (53.3), *munificentia* (54.2), *opulentia* (6.3), *luculentus* (31.6), *ductare* (11.5), *vastare* (15.4), *maturare, patrare* (18.8), *opitulari* (33.2); (b) common words given their archaic meaning, e.g. *dolus* (26.2), *exitium* (55.6), *facinus* (2.9), *supplicium* (9.2), *venenum* (11.3), *crescere* = *oriri* (10.3); (c) archaic combinations and alliterative phrases, a distinctly Catonian device, e.g. *asper ... arduus* (7.5), *modus-modestia* (11.4), *animus amplior* (40.6), *hostem ferire* (7.6, 60.4), *aetem agere* (4.1) and words given their older forms, e.g. *colos* (15.5), *lepos* (25.5). At 1.4 *fluxa atque fragilis* illustrates a particularly prominent feature of Sallustian style, viz. his use of alliterative and synonym doublets, elements regarded as archaic and probably poetic in origin, a factor which may in part explain their appearance in a writer so passionately addicted to brevity. E. Skard (*SO* 39 (1964) 13-36) lists ninety-four of these doublets. Not all are alliterative and they include the coupling of synonymous adjectives, e.g. 5.1 *malo pravoque,* 19.1 *infestum inimicum,* cf. 14.5, 20.3, 27.2, 52.20; of nouns, e.g. 2.3 *regum atque imperatorum,* 25,3 *decus atque pudicitia,* cf. 15.5, 33.4, 35.3, 48.1, 61.9; of verbs, e.g. 11.4 *rapere trahere,* 42.2 *festinando agitando*; of adverbs, e.g. 51.9 *composite atque magnifice.* On the archaic nature of this type of *exaggeratio* see E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Berlin, 1922, 361; Hofmann, *Umgangssprache* 93; note, too, the occasional use of *figura etymologica,* e.g. 35.4 *honore honestatos*; (d) Sallust's use of frequentatives, of which *agitare* (e.g. 2.1) is the most common,

has been described as a colloquialism (J. Uric, *Quatenus apud Sallustium sermonis latini plebei aut cotidiani vestigia appareant*, Paris, 1885), but such a usage is generally accepted as an archaism (E. Norden, *Ennius u. Vergilius*, Leipzig, 1915, 45; P. Schultze, *De Archaismis Sallustianis*, Diss. Halle, 1871, 67) taken over from Cato by Sallust (E. Wölfflin, *ALLG* 4, 206).

Archaism in sentence structure and syntax can be exemplified by 5.2 where *ibique* is equivalent to *in quibus* (*rebus*). This use of an adverb to substitute for pronoun with preposition occurs also at 20.8 (*ubi* = *apud quos*), *BJ* 14.22. The use of *-que -que* (e.g. 9.3). to connect two words is archaic and poetical. The swing between active and passive in Sallustian sentences illustrates his striving after *variatio*, and his liking for a passive phrasing (e.g. 10.1, *BJ* 75.7, 104.5) imparts that air of archaism he looked for. See Ernout, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 15, 289ff. and his remark (329ff.) that the frequent omission of the agent corresponds with old Latin usage; cf. Wackernagel, 1.143. The use of *quippe* with the indicative, e.g. 11.8, 13.2, 19.2, 52.20, the use of *quo* = *ut*, without an accompanying comparative, e.g. 11.5, 14.3, 33.1, 38.3, 58.3, the use of *postremo* without the temporal element being involved, e.g. 47.1, are clearly archaisms. Finally, Sallust's extensive use of historic infinitives, e.g. 6.5, 11.4, 13.3, 17.1, 31.3, 56.4, 60.4 should also be considered one of his archaisms.

Sallust's neologisms also drew the attention of ancient critics, Probus calls him *novator verborum* (apud Gell. 1.15.18). One can point in the *Bellum Catilinae* to words not attested earlier than Sallust, e.g. *antecapere* (13.3), *portatio* (42.2), *incruentus* 61.7; he was probably also responsible for the introduction into the language of other composites similar to *incruentus*, e.g. *incelebratus, incuriosus, infecundus, inmutilatus* etc. This label of *novator* may also apply to his revival of old, sometimes forgotten, meanings as with *necessitudo* etc., mentioned above; Gellius (11.7.2) says *nova videri dico etiam ea quae sunt immutata et desita, etsi sunt vetusta.* As already remarked, the archaic and the poetical sometimes coincide, and one can note in Sallust the poetical flavour of such words as *mortalis, vecordia, profugus, insons.*

Syntactical constructions which might be called characteristically Sallustian are the coupling of a principal clause in the present tense with a subordinate clause in the future perfect, e.g. 12.3, 20.9, 51.3, 51.4, 51.24, 58.16; the use of the instrumental

modal *per*, e.g. 7.4, 13.2, 20.2, 20.9, 41.5; the use of an infinitive with verbs which are more usually found with a different construction, e.g. note the rare use of an infinitive after *dubitare*, in an affirmative sentence (15.2), cf. *coniurare* in 52.24 and the note on *hortari* in 5.9; his widening of the use of the historic infinitive by the employment of passive historic infinitives, e.g. *fatigari* 27.2 and the coupling of finite tenses with the historic infinitive, e.g. 11.4, 13.3, 24.2, 25.5, 48.1, 56.4, 60.4; the alternation of genitive and ablative after *egeo* (e.g. 1.7) and *potior* (47.2); the direct accusative after *laetari* (51.29); the ablative after *expers* (33.2); the use of *in* with a neuter adjective in lieu of a simple adjective or adverb, e.g. *in incerto* 41.1; the neuter abl. sing. of the passive participle used instead of the verbal noun, e.g. *consulto* ... *facto* 1.6; adjectives used in a passive sense, e.g. *innoxii* 39.2; the coupling of an adverb and a noun used adverbially, e.g. *recte atque ordine* 51.4; the gerundive of purpose, e.g. *conservandae libertatis* 6.7; *ire* with the supine, e.g. 36.4. More than any other prose writer Sallust uses adverbs as adjectival predicate, e.g. 20.2 *frustra*, 21.1 *abunde*, cf. 23.7, 58.9; the same applies to the use of the pluperfect for the aorist perfect, e.g. 24.1, 36.5, 50.4, 56.2; the use of *sicuti* as equivalent to *quasi* or *tamquamsi*, e.g. 28.1, 31.5, 37.5, 38.3, 53.5, is almost confined to Sallust.

Some of the usages referred to above, e.g. *constructio ad sensum*, variation in number after a collective noun, as well as the infinitive used to explain intention or plan, e.g. 52.24 *coniuravere* ... *incendere*, and the genitive instead of ablative at 40.5, *aliena consili* could be explained as imitations of Greek usages. On Grecisms in Sallust see Quintilian 9.3.17; E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 2. 412ff.

Sallust's narrative method naturally varies according to the content and intention of different parts of the work. I have not attempted, therefore, a general discussion of narrative method, but have confined myself to introductory notes on method at key-points in the Commentary, e.g. at 1.1-1.4, at 5.1-8, at ch. 20, at 27-31, at 31.5ff.

Works dealing in some detail with specific features of Sallustian style are: L. Constans, *De sermone Sallustiano*, Paris, 1880; L. S. Fighiera, *La lingua e la grammatica de C. Sallustio Crispo*, Savona 1896 [1], 1902 [2], 1905 [3]; W. Kroll, "Die Sprache des Sallust", *Glotta* 15 (1927) 280-305; E. Skard, *Ennius und Sallustius* etc. *Avhandl. Norske Vid. Ak.*, Oslo, 1933, 4 (some of the conclusions of which

should be treated with caution, cf. S. Cavallin, "Det episka inslaget i Sallustius' stil", *Eranos* 35 (1937) 68-101); *idem, Sallust und seine Vorgänger, SO* Fasc. Suppl. 15 (1956), "Zur sprachlichen Entwicklung des Sallust", *SO* 39 (1964) 13-36; R. Syme, *Sallust*, ch. XIV and App. I.

4. *Judgements on Sallust*

Judgements on Sallust have been influenced to some extent by the kind of allegation about his private life and public career which came into currency among ancient writers, but largely by the interpretations put upon the way in which he has presented the historical material of his monographs.

Reports and assumptions of a scandalous private life, of rapacious and extortionate conduct as an official in Africa, of a life of ease and luxury amid the splendour of the house on the Quirinal quickly gave rise to censorious or even shocked expressions concerning the contradiction between the moralising tone of the writings and the reprehensible conduct of the writer. Representative of this view is the comment of Lactantius (2.12.14): *servivit foedissimis voluptatibus, suamque ipse sententiam pravitate dissolvit.*

The spirit which prompted such charges and the shocked reaction among critics can well be divined from the words of Gellius, reporting a story on the authority of Varro: *C. Sallustium scriptorem seriae illius et severae orationis, in cuius historia notiones censorias fieri atque exerceri videmus, in adulterio deprehensum ab Annio Milone loris bene caesum dicit et, cum dedisset pecuniam, dimissum* (17.18). They doubted the sincerety of his statement in *BC* 3.4: *animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium* and objected to the self-righteous tone of *cum ab reliquorum malis moribus dissentirem* (3.5). They felt, not without justification, that they could detect a note of guilt in his strident moralising about *luxuria* etc. This is an attitude which persisted among scholars of the Renaissance and the problem of the contrast between conduct and writings loomed large in the thinking of 18th century scholarship (cf. F. Schindler, *Untersuchungen z. Geschichte des Sallustbildes*, Diss. Breslau, 1939, 43ff., App. VI). Traces of it are still to be detected; thus M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians*, 48, doubts "the probity of the reformed burglar who turned policeman". See especially Syme, 269ff., 278ff.

Sallust's personality, conduct and experience cannot be divorced

from his performance as a writer. It is mainly a question of how far these factors should be allowed to influence judgement on the status of Sallust as a historian. In modern times Sallust has been the object of the most varied judgement on the part of scholars. E. Schwartz in a famous paper, "Die Berichte über die Catilinarische Verschwörung", *Hermes* 32 (1897) 554ff. = *Ges.Schr.* II (1956) 275ff., put forward the view that Sallust was a political pamphleteer, a Caesarian partisan who painted the events of the Catilinarian conspiracy in terms of propaganda favourable to Caesar and carried his partisanship to the extent of changing the actual course of events. This point of view dominated Sallustian scholarship in the succeeding decades, but the statements in E. Meyer's *Caesars Monarchie und das Prinzipat des Pompeius*, 1918, 352ff., 383ff., 558ff. led to a revision of thought and Sallust began to be viewed as a political thinker and theorist rather than as a party-propagandist. Details of Schwartz's views and the refutation of the more extreme theorizing of his followers (cf. K. von Fritz, *TAPhA* 74 (1943) 134-168) are examined in the notes to the relevant sections of the text; see e.g. on 31.6 *orationem habuit luculentam*; 48.4 *praeterea se missum a M. Crasso.*

After the refutation of the partisan thesis the picture of Sallust that emerged took on two somewhat different aspects. There are some who view Sallust as a historian in whom scholarly intellect and a genuine striving after objectivity are acknowledged (e.g. W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, 1934). On the other hand attempts have been made to treat Sallust's writings as works of art in the first instance and thereby to explain the many inaccuracies in the monographs. With this point of view of Sallust as an artist, represented, e.g. by Büchner's work on the structure of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* in *Hermes*, Einzelschrift 9 (1953), emerged also the view of Sallust as a moralist who is preoccupied with the key-concept of *virtus*, a thesis which dominates, for instance, the work of V. Pöschl, *Grundwerte römischer Staatsgesinnung in den Geschichtswerken des Sallust* (1940). Finally there is the view represented by E. Howald, "Sallust", *Vom Geist antiker Geschichtsschreibung* (1944), 140ff., who seeks to understand Sallust from the point of view of Greek historiography and analyses the surprisingly strong and conflicting effect on the reader of a complex personality, manifested in the fluency and unique style of the author.

The truth about Sallust, as Syme (2) points out, is not to be

discovered in an exclusive pre-occupation with any one of the categories mentioned above. He will be found, as the Commentary, it is hoped, will demonstrate, to have fused into a unity elements which mark him as an artist, a moralist and a politician. His quality as a historian is determined to some extent by the form in which he chose to treat his material. Examined as history, his *Bellum Catilinae* exhibits manifold defects (Appendix III). Nevertheless, it is still a precious historical document; the social diagnosis by Sallust (esp. 36.4ff.) reveals what might otherwise have escaped record: the widespread discontent throughout Italy, provoked by excessive disparity in the distribution of wealth and the social and economic chaos which was largely the result of the Sullan settlements. The danger to the Republic represented by a Catiline who could count on widespread and variegated support is a symptom of the social and economic ills which ultimately account for the eclipse of the Republican system. As a literary work, the *Bellum Catilinae* was an epoch-making achievement in Latin literature, whereby a new style and a new manner of looking at history were introduced.

Sallust was highly esteemed by the ancients both as a historian and as a stylist. In spite of the fact that Livy disapproved both of *verba antiqua et sordida* (Seneca, *Contr.* 9.2.26) and regarded Sallust's views of mankind and politics with distaste (cf. L. Amundsen, *SO* 25 (1947) 31ff.), Sallust could not be denied his fame. For Martial he was *primus Romana Crispus in historia* (14.191.2) and Quintilian made his own reservation concerning the judgement by Servilius Nonianus which he reports in 10.1.102, namely that Sallust and Livy were *pares magis quam similes*, by pointing out that while Livy was useful for the education of boys, Sallust was the greater historian (2.5.19). Sallust's success in communicating his forceful moral judgements is shown by the influence he exerted on the Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who found in him powerful confirmation of the views they propounded concerning pagan society. This influence is exemplified above all by Augustine, to whose *De Civitate Dei* we owe our knowledge of important passages in Sallust's *Historiae* and for whom Sallust was *nobilitatae veritatis historicus* (*Civ.Dei.* 1.5).

But, as we have already noted, it was Sallustian style which was an immediate success and which continued to exert its influence. Seneca provides evidence of what amounted almost to a Sallust-

mania (*Ep.* 114.17ff.). The historian was imitated and commented upon by orators, philosophers and grammarians. While his works had considerable influence on the language, style and thought of the historian Velleius Paterculus (cf. A. J. Woodman, "Sallustian influence on Velleius Paterculus", *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, I, Brussels 1968, 785-99), what Sallust himself would probably have regarded as the climax of the *gloria* which was his goal was the compliment paid to him by the imitation of his style and attitude by the great imperial historian, Tacitus. For Tacitus, Sallust was *rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor* (*Ann.* 3.30.1); the extent and manner of his imitation of Sallust are discussed by R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958) 340ff., *Sallust*, (1964) 292ff.; cf. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 2 (1933) 276ff. The attraction which the personality, style and attitudes of Sallust continued to hold for scholars and readers from the Renaissance onwards is illustrated by F. Schindler's dissertation, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Sallustbildes*, Breslau, 1939. This attraction is confirmed by the number and variety of the works on Sallust which are reported in modern bibliographies (see Bibliographical note below).

For a general review of Sallust's career and writings the article "Sallustius" by G. Funaioli in *RE* IA. 1913-55 is still the standard work, with the reservation, noted above, concerning his acceptance of the spurious *Epistulae* as genuine. For English readers the first five chapters of Ronald Syme's *Sallust* will provide all the necessary information, and this may be supplemented by the short general treatment by G. M. Paul in *Latin Historians*, London, 1966, ch. IV. For the literary influence of Sallust down to modern times see E. Bolaffi, *Sallustio e la fortuna nei secoli*, Roma, 1949; Büchner, 356-382; Syme, ch. XV.

5. *The Text*

This commentary is based upon the text and *apparatus criticus* provided by the Teubner edition of A. Kurfess, 1957. In the notes to relevant passages I have indicated where I disagree with readings he has adopted, and give reasons, where appropriate, for suggesting alternative readings.

6. *Bibliographical note*

My debt to A. D. Leeman's *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust (1879-1964)*, *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 4, 1965, will be obvious.

Other bibliographical material on Sallust is to be found in the Teubner edition of A. Kurfess (ed. 3, 1957, XVIff., 199f.); the "Fachbericht" of H. Dietrich, *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 533ff.; Ronald Syme, *Sallust*, Cambridge/California, 1964, 355ff. A full and valuable bibliography on the Catilinarian conspiracy has been compiled by N. Criniti in *Aevum* 41 (1967) 370-395.

COMMENTARY

The Title

Many editors, using S.'s own phrase (4.3), have given the monograph the title *De Coniuratione Catilinae*; some have contented themselves with a simple *Catilina*. There is no MSS authority for either of these titles. The *praescriptiones* and *subscriptiones* of the codices (listed by Kurfess, p. 1) vary between *Bellum Catilinarium*, *Liber Catilinarius*, *In Catilinario* (sc. *bello*), and *Bellum Catilinae*. The tradition therefore seems strong for the inclusion of the word '*Bellum*' in the title, but it should be remembered that medieval scribes were notably casual about titles. Thus the best MS (P = *cod. Paris.* 16024, ix cent.) has the *praescriptio* '*bellum Catilinarium incipit*' and the *subscriptio* '*bellum Catilinae explicit*'. The grammarians likewise describe the work in a variety of ways.

Quintilian's description of the two monographs: *in bello Jugurthino et Catilinae* (3.8.9) indicates that by his time the work was known as *Bellum Catilinae*. Florus, who took his account from S., calls his chapter on the conspiracy (2.12) *Bellum Catilinae*.

See further E. Wölfflin, *Archiv f. lat. lex.* I (1884), 277-9; A. W. Ahlberg, *Proleg. in Sallustium* III, ch. 1, Götenborg, 1911.

1.1-4.5. *The Prologue*

Like many other sections of S.'s work, the prologue has given rise to an imposing edifice of commentary which is remarkable both for the positive way in which conclusions are stated and for the fact that no uniform point of view has emerged as a result of this intensive study. Two major problems have occupied the attention of scholars: (i) the relevance of the prologue to the rest of the work, (ii) the sources of the concepts in the prologue. These points are discussed more fully in Appendixes I and II respectively.

If we accept the notion that Sallust, like all his predecessors, conformed to the convention of placing an *exordium* to his work, an *exordium* which contained traditional *topoi* such as *laudatio historiae*, reason for choice of subject etc., then I think we can conclude that the part traditionally entitled to the label 'prologue' ends at 4.5. This does not mean that all introductory matter ends here. See Appendix I.

For further treatment of the traditional historical preface, its

scope and its themes see Lucian, *Quomodo Historia* 52-4, supported in summary by the anonymous rhetorician in Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores*, 588f.; G. Engel, *De Antiquorum ... proemiis*, Diss. Marburg, 1910; T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, Stockholm, 1964, 64-83; Ogilvie, 23ff.

1.1-4.2. *Justification of the author's decision to write history*

Analysis of this segment is not simple, but the continuity of the argument is clearly discernible: 'Men must do something with their lives and preferably by dint of *virtus animi* rather than *vis corporis*. The former is the more effective in the sphere of war and government, and indeed all activities. Among worthwhile activities is the peculiarly difficult one of writing history. Since I have failed in the sphere of government, I propose to try my hand at that.'

Sallust makes use of two closely related concepts here—*virtus* and *gloria-memoria*. His lack of precision in the use of the term *virtus* (see on 1.3-4) and his reiteration of philosophical commonplaces means that his quite straightforward argument is obscured by the manner in which he chose to present it. The introduction to his second monograph, *Bellum Jugurthinum*, is a far more effective piece of writing. The untidiness of expression in this prologue is due partly to the fact that Sallust found it difficult to define *virtus*, a concept which is paramount in his thinking and which governs the content of the introductory section as a whole. See Appendix I.

1.1-4. S. states a general principle concerning *virtus-gloria*. Within this short section we are introduced to a characteristic feature of S.'s manner of exposition. This is his habit of using familiar and even commonplace material as the framework for the specific concept he wishes to emphasise. In this case he draws on a well-known store of Greek philosophical ideas in order to present a notion of *virtus* which is essentially Roman. For an application of the same principle, but with a different thought content, see the introductory remarks to chs. 6-13.

1.1-2. **Omneis homines ... commune est:** a series of well-known concepts for which many parallels can be cited. The idea of the superiority of man over all other living animals is expressed by Isocrates, *Paneg.* 48. A close verbal parallel with *veluti pecora ... finxit* can be seen in Plato, *Rep.* 586a and the idea is also expressed in Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.4.11. The notion of the dualism of man,

sed nostra omnis vis ... commune est, has its clearest echo in Plato, *Phaed.* 80a. Wirz's citation of Isocrates, *Antid.* 180, despite the doubts expressed by Avenarius (*SO* 33 (1957), 80), is also apt.

The number and variety of parallels—cf. S. O. Dickerman, *De argumentis quibusdam ap. Xenophontem, Platonem, Aristotelem obviss e structura hominis et animalium petitis,* Diss. Halle, 1909—should warn against a rash assumption that S. was working from a particular model rather than drawing upon a store of knowledge available to all educated Romans of his time. Their familiarity with these concepts may be illustrated from Cicero's *Fin.* 5.34: *perspicuum est hominem e corpore animoque constare, cum primae sint animi partes, secundae corporis*; *Leg.* 1.26. Cf. also Ovid, *Metam.* 1.84ff.; Sil. Ital. 15.84ff.; Persius, *Sat.* 2.61; Juvenal, 15.147. See Appendix II.

1.1. **Omneis:** there is overwhelming MS support for *omnis* here, a reading accepted by most editors. Kurfess reads *omneis* from Charisius (1.140K). *Eis* for *-is* is a case of inverse spelling, a false archaism as it were. While it is possible that S. may have used the form *omneis* on the assumption that it was archaic, the unfamiliar *ei* being replaced by the more familiar *i* or *e* by the scribes, we should accept the very strong transmission *omnis* here. See on 51.1.

sese student praestare: accus. and infin. instead of simple infin. when the subject of both verbs is the same is somewhat rare. It is found in Cicero, *Off.* 2.70: *gratum se videri studet.* Cf. *ibid.* 2.78; Plautus, *Asin.* 67-8, 183; Terence, *Eun.* 1. The pronoun may be included for emphasis. S. uses the same construction with *properare* in 7.6.

summa ope niti: instead of the more usual *summo opere*; cf. 38.2, *BJ* 9.2, 25.2, 31.17, *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.6.3. The phrase is not found in Cicero or Caesar. Note Ennius, *Ann.* 161, 412V: *summa nituntur opum vi,* which appears to be a cross between *summa ope,* as here, and *summa vi* as in Cato, 23.15J. The phrase was probably chosen by S. for its archaic flavour.

silentio: in a passive sense; cf. 2.8 *de utraque siletur.* They go through life unnoticed, they are *sine gloria* both in their lifetime and after death. *Ne vitam silentio transeant* is equivalent to *gloriam quaerere* and *memoriam quam maxume longam efficere* of 1.3. The emphasis is on the activity required—cf. 7.6—and this is partly achieved by the use of the verb *transire* here instead of the more

usual *agere* or *degere vitam*; the lack of activity is thus underlined.

1.2. **sed:** not adversative here, but as in 25.1 it simply introduces a new concept, as other writers would use *verum* or *autem*. Cf. Servius, *ad Aen.* 10.411.

omnis vis: i.e. *virtus*; cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.3.6 *quorum omnis vis virtusque in lingua sita est*; Servius, *ad Aen.* 2.452.

animi imperio ... utimur: "the mind commands, the body serves us"; *utimur imperio* is used quite generally as in *valetudine uti*. For the sentiment cf. *BJ* 1.3 *sed dux atque imperator vitae mortalium animus est*; *ibid.* 2.3; Seneca, *Ep.* 114.23 *rex noster est animus*; Cicero, *Rep.* 3.37.

alterum ... alterum: can hardly refer to *animi imperio* (*uti*) and *corporis servitio* (*uti*) respectively, because we have already been told that animals are slaves to their bodies (as indeed are some humans, cf. 2.8). *Alterum* in each case must refer somewhat loosely to *animus* and *corpus*.

beluis: S. has already used *animalia* and *pecora* in a careful way; *animalia* includes man, *pecora* emphasises the idea of passivity and sluggishness of animals whose major interests are those of the belly. *Belua* is thus chosen as the best opposite to *di*. Cicero (*Nat. Deor.* 2.29) uses *belua* in a somewhat similar context: (*natura*) *habere aliquem in se principatum, ut in homine mentem, in belua quiddam simile mentis*; cf. *id.*, *Off.* 1.11-12.

1.3-4. **quo mihi rectius ... aeternaque habetur:** the parallels cited for this passage—Isocrates, *in Nicoclem* 37, *Paneg.* 76-7; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 1.5.9-10, carry only partial similarities with S.'s statement.

The related concepts of *virtus* and *gloria-memoria* are crucial for S.'s viewpoint, not only of man as an individual, but inevitably, since he is a Roman, as one engaged in public affairs. For S. *virtus* is a quality which must be expressed in action and whose reward is *gloria*. Conversely, the striving after immortality, the contest for *fama* is the strongest inducement to *virtus* (cf. 9.2, *BJ* 2.1-2). Expressed here in its most general form, this thought-complex will be applied in more detailed terms as the criterion of a genuinely Roman goal for all men (2.9, 7.6, 11.1-2, *BJ* 2.4).

Yet here and in other passages a clear understanding of S.'s meaning is made difficult by his lack of precision in the use of terminology. Thus the word *virtus* is used in a number of overlapping senses. It can mean generalised excellence, as in *virtus animi*,

which is productive of wise deliberation (1.5f.) and which embraces such qualities as *labor, continentia* and *aequitas* (2.5), while *virtus* alone is what makes a good ploughman, sailor or builder. It can also mean any individual good moral quality which can be listed alongside *pudor* and *abstinentia* (3.3) and opposed to *avaritia* (12.1); at times the idea of manly courage is paramount (6.5, 7.5).

We are on surer ground with the notion of *gloria.* The concepts *gloria, fama, decus, claritudo* are to be met with from the beginning of Latin literature. For *gloria* as the goal of achievement cf. Plautus, *Aul.* 541, *Trin.* 273-4; Cato, 15.1J. For *gloria* as the reward of great deeds cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 391f. V *gloria ... ostendat si vivimus sive morimur.* See also Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.32, *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 7, *pro Arch.* 28; Virgil, *Aen.* 4.232-3; Horace, *Od.* 3.30.

For more detailed treatments of S.'s concept of *virtus* etc. see Egermann, *SAWW* 214, 3 (1932); Steidle, *Hermes* 78 (1943) 89-90; Büchner, 301, 320; Earl, ch. 1. For the Roman character of S.'s thought on these points cf. Egermann, *ibid.* esp. 73ff.; Büchner, 115f.; Perrochat, 53, 59; Earl, ch. 2.

1.3. **quo mihi rectius ... longam efficere:** for the same idea cf. *BJ* 1.5.

ingeni quam virium opibus: expressed as *virtus animi—vis corporis* in 1.5. The idea of *virtus animi* will be further defined in 2.5, 2.9 etc.

vita ipsa qua fruimur: i.e. our life on earth as contrasted with the posthumous life in the *memoria* of those left behind. For the Roman idea of *gloria* in *memoria* cf. Ennius, *Var.* 17-18V; Cicero, *pro Mil.* 97, *pro Marc.* 26, *pro Sest.* 143; Horace, *Od.* 3.30. See Earl, ch. 2.

quam maxume longam: according to L-H-S, 165ff. a usage such as *maxime longus* for *longissimus* in prose is post-classical; S.'s decision not to use the more usual *quam longissimam efficere* may be due to his desire to gain better contrast to *brevis.*

1.4. **nam divitiarum ... aeternaque habetur:** for the idea cf. *BJ* 2.2. If S. intended here to reinforce the conclusion of 1.3 he has chosen a peculiar way of expressing it. *Nam* is additive not explicative here, and the idea is tossed in more or less as an afterthought. This is almost a Stoic concept in its rejection of beauty and riches; cf. Diog. Laert. 7.102.

fluxa atque fragilis: a synonym doublet; see Introd. p. 18. *fluxa* in the meaning *incertus, instabilis* is relatively rare, cf. *Thes.*

LL. 6.983; Kroll, 303. Its use by Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.75.1, 3.48.2, 4.23.4 is one of the multitudinous items of evidence for his debt to S.

habetur: retains its proper force, "is a possession"; cf. 58.17. As such it is an archaic usage. See *Thes. LL.* 6.2396 for a list of the notions inherent in the verb *habere*; cf. *ibid.* 2459.11 for a view contrary to the one expressed here. On the antithesis so evident in the above segment (1.1-4), *homines-animalia, animus-corpus, imperio-servitio* etc., see introd. p. 17.

1.5-2.6: In this section we meet with a second feature of S.'s manner of exposition. This is his habit of starting with a general statement which is then further expounded in specific terms. We shall also find, as here, that often the specific exposition becomes in its turn a fresh general statement; this again requires a more specific analysis and so the process goes on. Thus 1.5-2.6 applies the general principle enunciated in 1.1-4 to the sphere of government (*imperium*). It is applied in terms of the antithesis war-peace. This analysis leads to a general statement in 2.5 which will require further analysis at a later stage.

1.5-2.2. The question as to the relative excellence of *vis corporis* and *virtus animi* in war is examined. In war as such *virtus* amounts to an intelligent application of physical power. But when war becomes an instrument of domination, and success gives rise to problems of government and control of subjects then the exercise of *ingenium* is the far more important element.

Xenophon, *Cyr.* 3.3.19 provides an earlier example of the general line of thought here, though it is confined to the winning of battles: ὡς αἱ μάχαι κρίνονται μᾶλλον ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἢ ταῖς τῶν σωμάτων ῥώμαις.

1.5. **sed diu magnum ... magis procederet:** cf. 7.4 and 7. War is a necessary preliminary to *imperium*, and *virtus* remains indispensable from the outset. *Sed* is strongly adversative to the opinion expressed in 1.3 *mihi rectius videtur ingeni quam virium opibus* etc. Now S. says: "But for a long time this point was disputed."

mortalis: used in the plural by itself often. S. always writes *multi mortales* never *multi homines*, preferring no doubt the alliterative effect of *multi mortales* and *omnes homines*, and probably desiring to avoid the hiatus *multi / homines*. He uses *omnes mortales* and *omnes homines* indifferently, and there is nothing to support the view that S. uses *mortales* because it is an archaic word or provides an opposite to *di*. Nor is it, as Fronto (apud Gell. 13.29)

states, a more comprehensive word than *homines*, at least as far as S.'s usage is concerned. Livy and Tacitus follow S. in the free use of this word, but cf. Cicero, *in Pis.* 96; *2Verr.* 2.166; *Har. Resp.* 32; Horace, *Od.* 1.3.37. See Wackernagel, 2.286f.

vine corporis an virtute animi: S. is not very precise with philosophical definitions. One has to, as it were, forge a definition out of the various ways in which he expresses an idea. (See on 1.3-4; Earl, 10). Thus *omnis vis* = *virtus* of 1.2 is now more precisely divided into *vis corporis-virtus animi*. Philosophical precision is not S.'s aim; he is rushing to apply the moral concept to the sphere of conduct.

procederet: i.e. *prospere cedere*. Cf. 27.3; Cato, *RR.* 148 *totidem dies emptori procedent*; Terence, *Adelph.* 979; Plautus, *Rud.* 90, *Truc.* 516.

1.6. **nam et prius ... opus est:** a widely canvassed thought. Cf. Thucydides, 2.40.2, 1.70.7-8; Demosthenes, *Phil.* 1.14, 4.30; Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1142b.

incipias ... consulueris: the pres. and perf. subj. used with the "generalising" 2nd pers. sing. Cf. Cato (apud Gell. 11.2.6) *si exerceas conteritur*; Plautus, *Aul.* 505. Such a subj. usage becomes common with persons of the verb other than the ideal 2nd pers. only from Livy onwards. Before this the indic. was used.

consulto ... facto: neut. abl. sing. of the passive participle used for the verbal noun. Cf. 31.7, 43.3; Priscian, 3.226K. L-H-S, 123 notes that is an early Latin usage.

1.7. **alterum:** takes up *utrumque*, but is not really necessary. Cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 2.13 *ita est utraque res sine altera debilis.*

auxilio: S. generally uses the genitive with *eget*. Cf. 51.37, *BJ* 14.23, 31.29, 89.5 *et al.* The ablative occurs in *BJ* 1.3, 14.3.

2.1. **igitur:** always put as first word by S., except in questions (e.g. 20.14, 51.43). An archaism which occurs sometimes in Cicero, more often in Livy. See *Thes. LL.* 7.253.5ff.; Fraenkel, *JRS* 41 (1951) 192-4. Probably a practice of earlier historiography, it may have commended itself to S. because of Cato's usage, cf. Cato (apud Gell. 10.24.7). Here it can be explained as an anaphoric *igitur*, taking up 1.5 after the parenthesis of 1.6. Cf. *Thes. LL.* 7.266.73.

initio reges ... satis placebant: the statement that monarchy is the first form of government occurs in Thucydides, 1.13.1; Polybius, 6.4.7 (see Walbank's notes *ad loc.*); Cicero, *Rep.* 2.23f.;

Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.1. The idea is expressed also in the philosophers, e.g. Plato, *Laws* 3.680d; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1252b. That it was a commonplace by S.'s time is shown by Cicero, *Leg.* 3.4 *omnes antiquae gentes regibus quondam paruerunt.* Cf. *id., Off.* 2.41.

-nam in terris ... primum fuit-: for the parataxis see Introd. p. 14.

pars ... alii: for the *inconcinnitas* of sentence structure see introd. p. 15.

etiam tum ... satis placebant: on the exclusion of a stage of primitive simplicity from the arena of worthwhile activity, i.e. the exercise of *ingenium* in the pursuit of *gloria* see further on 6.1 n. *genus hominum agreste.*

etiam tum: to be retained and explained as equivalent to *etiam nunc* in respect of past time. Cf. *Thes. LL.* 5.971. It seems to have some connection with *tum demum* of 2.2.

cupiditate: a form rarely used by S. It occurs again only at 5.4, 21.4. He prefers *cupido* (cf. 3.5, 7.3, 10.3, 13.3 and often in *BJ*), a form which is avoided by Cicero and Caesar. *Cupido* could have been taken from Cato by S. (Skard, *SO* Suppl. 15, 1956). See also Syme, 262.

agitabatur: the most common of the frequentatives used by S. See Introd. p. 18. *Agitare* is used in a variety of ways by S.: "to stir up" literally (*BJ* 53.1) and metaphorically (*BC* 5.7); "to be engaged in" (*BC* 53.4). The intransitive use, in the sense of *agere*, to live, as here, (cf. *BJ* 18.9) is definitely archaic (*Thes. LL.* 1.1338). The verb does however convey that note of activity which is essential to S.'s concept of *virtus-gloria*, and forms an effective contrast with *vitam silentio transeant* of 1.1.

2.2. **postea vero ... plurumum ingenium posse:** by a series of experiences men came to find that *ingenium* was most important even in war, the obvious theatre for the exercise of *vis corporis*. But the real test is in the time of peace. For an application of this general principle to a particular Roman setting, cf. ch. 9.

The examples used by S., Cyrus in Asia, the Athenian-Spartan struggle in Greece, are chosen because of their appropriateness to the theme. In both cases it is a story of the rise and fall of a great empire, prototypes of the Roman *imperium*. S. is not interested here in similarities or differences in detail, simply in the enunciation of a general principle.

habere: the following *putare* would suggest that *habere* carries a similar meaning; however it also retains something of its original force: "they began to have etc."

putare: S. tends to omit *esse* with *putare, existimare, arbitrari.* Cf. Fighiera, *La lingua* etc. 238f.; Vretska on *Inv. in Cic.* 1.2.

tum demum: this emphatic manner of introducing the last part of a sentence—cf. *tum vero* of 61.1—seems most likely to have been imitated from Cato. See Latte, *NWzA* (1935) 12; Kroll, 297, n. 2.

periculo atque negotiis: Nonius on *periculum* (578L) quotes this passage to show that sometimes *periculum* = *experimentum*; etymologically this is correct since both originate from *experiri* and the idea is clearly retained in *periclitor, periculum facere.* Hence some editors explain: "*periculo,* i.e. *experimento, experiendo*". Others explain the phrase by the figure hendiadys for *periculosis negotiis.* If it were a translation of Thucydides' μετὰ πόνων καὶ κινδύνων (1.70.8) the latter would be the more likely explanation, but the context is by no means the same and Nonius' assumption "it was found out by experience" seems to be more appropriate than "it was found out as the result of dangers".

2.3-6. **quod si regum ... transfertur:** the qualities of *virtus animi* which were responsible for the creation of a great *imperium* are needed just as much in time of peace. Indeed it is more difficult to preserve the qualities of *virtus* in time of peace than under the stress of war. The concept of peace as a danger is a commonly expressed notion, e.g. Catullus, 51.15-16 *otium et reges prius et beatas / perdidit urbes.* Contrast Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1177b4; Horace, *Od.* 2.16. See H. Fuchs, *HSPh* 63 (1958) 363-85, esp. 367.

This notion receives a general Roman application in chs. 10-13, and a contemporary application in 52.21-2, 53.4-5; in all cases the emphasis is on the activity which *virtus* demands.

2.3. **quod si:** here means "and if"; elsewhere it has the meaning "but if".

regum atque imperatorum: not even probably applied to Cyrus or the Greek generals, an identification which some maintain. War is precisely the field of kings and generals. See Introd. p. 18, for S.'s liking for doublets. Skard's conjecture of a covert reference to Caesar is not tenable.

aequabilius atque constantius: imitated by Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.21.4.

neque aliud ... neque ... cerneres: explanatory clause (Introd. p. 15).

ferri ... cerneres: cf. Plato, *Ep.* 7.325e.

2.4 **nam imperium ... partum est:** Wirz's citation of Polybius, 10.36.5 is very apt. S. however expresses the thought more succinctly. Like most of the concepts expressed here it was widely known and canvassed. Indeed its presence here is hardly necessary to the sense, except that with *iis artibus* S. is able to give more clear statement to his ideas. *Artes* is a word used in a special sense by S. It denotes moral character exhibited in action, viz. qualities. See further on 2.9, 11.2.

2.5. **verum ubi ... cum moribus inmutatur:** in the previous sentence and in this S. is spelling out in detail the thought already expressed in 2.3. It is an unwieldy method of exposition but it does achieve the object of emphasising what he considered important. Here, by his favourite method of antithesis he underlines more specifically what qualities are included in *virtus animi*. They are *labor, continentia, aequitas* (the *bonae artes*); with them are contrasted their opposing vices, *desidia, lubido, superbia* (the *malae artes*). This is an important general statement which will receive a fuller analysis both in the case of early Rome (chs. 6-9 for *bonae artes*; chs. 10-13 for *malae artes*) and of the Catilinarian conspiracy (ch. 52). Indeed the moral viewpoint contained in these and allied concepts is the feature which controls S.'s handling of his theme throughout.

invasere: a favourite verb of S., used especially of feelings. Used absolutely here as in 5.6, 10.6. Elsewhere, 12.2, 31.1, 36.5, it takes the accus. Livy seems to have copied S. in this, e.g. 9.35.6, 37.20.10. Cicero nearly always uses a preposition. Cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.7.4 *cupido divitiarum invasit.*

fortuna: for S.'s interpretation of this important concept see on 10.1.

2.6. **ad optumum quemque:** there is an ambiguity here. Is S. referring to rulers only? We note that the principle is applied to the Roman kings in 6.7. Or is it applied to nations only? Or to both rulers and nations? The latter seems to be the intended reference. Egermann's (*SAWW* 214, 3 (1932) 49) parallel with Plato, *Rep.* 544d-e, which is warmly supported by Avenarius (*SO* 33 (1957) 82) perhaps brings out the meaning more clearly. Plato states that the constitution of a state depends on the moral atti-

tude of its citizens, S. that the fortunes of a state are decided by the same criterion. This is also, perhaps under the influence of Panaetius, the revised opinion of Polybius, as expressed in the prologue to Bk.3. Polybius now accepts that the blossoming of a people depends not on a form of constitution but on the character of its citizens; on this principle he forecasts for Rome an unavoidable political decay. (See esp. Walbank *ad loc.*, E. Kornemann, *Ph.* 86 (1931) 169ff.). That S. is thinking on the same lines, but not necessarily accepting the Platonic doctrine of inevitable change, is shown by his earlier words *imperium facile iis artibus retinetur quibus initio partum est.* Where these *artes* are replaced by their opposite vices *imperium* must pass from the hands of a people who have degenerated and become the possession of a people who still practise *bonae artes.*

Elsewhere S. uses *boni* (19.2, 48.4), *optimus quisque* (34.2) in a way which suggests political echoes (K. Hanell, *Er.* 43 (1945) 263-76). This is to be expected from the contexts in question. Here the context is a moral one, not political, and there is no justification for reading into it specific reference to contemporary events.

2.7-3.2. Man, being what he is (1.2), should be controlled in all his actions by *virtus*, the exercise of his *ingenium*. If he rejects the pursuit of *gloria*, he, in effect, gives up that part of his nature which he shares with the gods; he passes through life unnoticed. The life for which man is intended is lived only by those who seek *gloria* by action. This action may be of different kinds. Active participation in public affairs is the arena for the exercise of *virtus* and the pursuit of *gloria* which is most appropriate for a Roman. If, for some reason, the Roman is prevented from taking an active part in public life (*facere*) he can still serve the interests of the state and satisfy the duty of exercising his *virtus* in the pursuit of *gloria* by writing the history of *res Romanorum* (*dicere-scribere*).

The *virtus* with which S. is dealing, based as it is on *ingeni opes* (1.3), goes beyond the exclusive area of activity implied by the Roman aristocratic ideal, where its exercise is restricted to the *res publica* and to the *nobiles*. (See Earl, ch. 2). The use of the powers of *ingenium* to attain *praeclara facinora* (cf. 53.2), to win *gloria* by the exercise of *bonae artes* extends to every field of human endeavour.

The reason for this extension of a traditional concept may be both political and personal. In his treatment of the basic reasons

for Rome's rise to greatness S. places emphasis on *concordia*, the fruit of *virtus*, between the classes (9.1, *BJ* 41.2), and in the indictment of contemporary degeneration which he places in the mouth of Cato (52.5-6) he clearly shows that the aristocracy had perverted both the meaning and the application of the concept of *virtus* (Earl, ch. 3). As far as the personal angle is concerned, S. will be engaged, in the passages which immediately follow this segment, in showing that truly Roman *virtus* can be exercised in the field of historiography, even if the *gloria* thereby attained is somewhat inferior to that achieved by active participation in public affairs.

2.7. **Quae homines ... virtuti omnia parent:** the concept of *virtus-gloria* in 1.1-4 is applied to all men in all fields of endeavour. Wirz sees in this an application of the basic idea of *virtus* to the activities of private life, and explains *arant, navigant, aedificant* as a selection by S. of the favourite activities of great men in Rome which are carried on by noble means; activities of expanding beneficence, trade by sea, erection of public buildings.

Two of the activities mentioned, farming and building, are directly referred to later by S. in uncomplimentary terms (4.1 and 12.3, 13.1), and trade practices are undoubtedly included in the strictures concerning the treatment of the *socii* (e.g. 52.6). It is clearly S.'s opinion that the degeneration which marks his age has infected Roman morals both with regard to public responsibility and private activities. He is here, therefore, in selecting three activities as representing the range of action of the Roman as a private citizen, underlining the fact that *virtus* must have its place; divergence from a moral code leads to results which are ruinous not only for the individual but also for the state.

Quae homines arant etc. could also be rendered, perhaps more clearly, as *quae homines arando navigando aedificando efficiunt.*

virtuti omnia parent: cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 651f. *virtus omnia in sese habet, omnia adsunt bona quem penest virtus*, which renders the same idea in an inverse way.

omnia: is best taken as a comprehensive nominative of which the three named activities are specific examples. All of these activities are carried out under the aegis of *virtus*. This interpretation may be the reason behind Kroll's suggestion (295) of *omnia* as an accusative of respect, which would be suitable to the meaning. The meaning, however, does not compel us to take *omnia* as accusative.

parent: the meaning is underlined by Horace's satirical use of the same verb, *Sat.* 2.3.94ff. *omnis enim res / virtus fama decus divina humanaque pulchris / divitiis parent,* where *parent* can be rendered as "subject to", "controlled by".

2.8. **sed multi mortales ... de utraque siletur:** the same idea is expressed at length in *BJ* 2.4. The closeness to Stoic concepts of the ideas expressed here has been remarked upon by S. Pantzer-hielm-Thomas, *SO* 15-16 (1936) 140-62; E. Bolaffi, *Athenaeum* 16 (1938) 128-57. Like the Greek philosophical concepts discernible in ch. 1, Stoic ideas were well canvassed and S. does not hesitate to use them to support the presentation of his major concept.

dediti ventri atque somno: imitated by Tacitus, *Germ.* 15.1 *plus per otium transigunt dediti somno ciboque.* The meaning is probably best provided by the parallel in Seneca, *Benef.* 7.2.2 *ventri ac libidini deditos quorum animus inerti otio torpet.*

indocti incultique: some commentators distinguish between these words as applying to *animus* and *corpus* respectively. But S. is rather using one of his favourite doublet expressions (Introd. p. 18), and employing both words to convey the *desidia* of the people under discussion.

transigere: Kurfess' choice from the various MSS readings, *transigere, transiere, transire, transegere,* is not a good one. *Transire* and *transigere* are ruled out by the presence of *fuit.* These forms would hardly have arisen from *transegere* and thus show *transiere* to be the original reading. *Transiere* is also more appropriate to *peregrinantes,* wandering through life without purpose or goal (1.1). Cf. Plato, *Rep.* 586a.

quibus profecto ... oneri fuit: as with *transiere vitam* etc. above there is here a conscious recall of the concepts of 1.1-4. There is the same antithesis of *corpus-anima* and a repetition of the part played by *natura.*

anima: some would ascribe to S. a subtlety of distinction here, saying that *anima* is preferred to *animus* in this context because humans whose existence is brutish should be assigned only the *anima* which the brutes share with man. S., however, uses these terms always in their normal meaning, i.e. *anima* = the life principle; *animus* = the mind. *Anima* is the required word here. See further on 2.9.

oneri: the idea of the body as *onus, vinculum* on the soul is a common thought; cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.75 *et saep.*, *Rep.* 6.15;

Seneca, *Ep.* 26.2, *Helv. de Cons.* 11.6 *et saep.* It occurs also in Plato, e.g. *Phaed.* 62b, 82c, *Crat.* 400c and is probably a doctrine of Orphism.

iuxta aestimo: *iuxta* equivalent to *pariter*, a usage favoured by S. Cf. 37.8 (*iuxta ac*), and without copula 51.30, 61.7. The *iuxta mecum* of 58.5 occurs in Plautus, e.g. *Aul.* 682, *Miles* 234. Cf. Cicero, *post Red. in Sen.* 20 *iuxta ac si.*

siletur: the connection with 1.1 is obvious. Cf. Sil. Ital. 3.145 *quantum etenim distant a morte silentia vitae?*; Tacitus, *Agr.* 3.

2.9. **verum enim vero... iter ostendit:** S. here provides a more specific explanation of *ingeni quam virium ... quaerere* of 1.3. The idea of activity is emphasised; the motive and reward is *fama* (cf. *gloria, memoria,* 1.3; *gloria,* 3.2, *BJ* 1.5 *claritudo, BJ* 2.4). There is more precise indication of the kind of activity: *aliquo negotio ... famam quaerere.* In a typically Sallustian way this specific application of a general principle becomes in its turn a generalisation. Chapters 3 and 4 will be devoted to a more detailed analysis of this statement.

verum enim vero: use of the emphatic double particle (cf. L-H-S 494f.) occurs also at 20.10. Its use by Livy, e.g. 4.4.9, 24.5.2, 29.8.7 *et al.* indicates perhaps that it was one of the features which persisted in the language of historiography. Its origins in early poetry seem indicated by Cicero's quotation from Accius in *Tusc. Disp.* 1.105, where *immo enimvero* occurs. Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 999; Terence, *Adelph.* 255; Cato, 27.2J = *HRR.* fr. 108; Cicero, 2*Verr.* 3.194.

vivere atque frui anima: in view of the common occurrence of synonym-doublets in S. (Introd. p. 18) it is doubtful that any subtle distinction between *vivere* and *frui anima* is intended here. Latin writers tend to reinforce *vivere* with a supplementary word. Cf. the *vivere-valere* combination in Plautus, e.g. *Miles* 1340 *bene valete et vivite, Stich.* 31, *Trin.* 52, 1075; Terence, *Heaut.* 430; Cicero, *pro Sest.* 108 *vivere ac spirare*; Virgil, *Aen.* 3.339 *superatne et vescitur aura.*

Seneca, who quotes S., also interprets the meaning, *Ep.* 60.4 *vivit is qui multis usui est* etc. Cf. Accius (296R) *sapimus animo, fruimur anima, sine animo anima est debilis.*

aliquo negotio: repeats the idea, already stated in 2.7, that the exercise of *virtus* is not restricted to any particular field.

aliquo negotio intentus: *aliquo* is the unanimous reading of the

MSS, supported by Arusian (7.488.9K) and Nonius (483L). If the abl. is to be retained one must assume the participial force of *intentus*, "strained", "kept on the stretch by" as in *BJ* 44.3 *expectatione eventus civium animos intentos putabat.* In spite of the strength of the transmission it is very likely that S. wrote *aliquoi*, a construction normal after *intentus*. See also on *colundo .... venando*, 4.1.

praeclari facinoris: the connection between *facinus* and *virtus* is best exemplified by the parallel of *BC* 1.4 *virtus clara aeternaque habetur* and *BJ* 2.2 *at ingeni egregia facinora sicut anima inmortalia sunt.*

On *facinus* Nonius (483L) states that it is equivalent to *factum*. In this monograph S. uses *facinus* approximately 23 times, *factum* 14 times. The use of *facinus* with a good or neutral meaning is archaic (Kroll, 303). Cf. Plautus, *Men.* 141, *Most.* 777; *Pseud.* 512, 576, 590; Terence, *Phorm.* 870; Livy, 3.12.5, 9.10.3 *et al.*

artis bonae: *ars* is described as follows in *Thes. LL.* 2.656: *vox rara apud priscos, dein per totam viguit latinitatem. notionem primitivam in prosam induxere Sall. Liv. Tac. potissimum.* It occurs in Cato (45.6, 60. 1J) in a manner close to that of S. In defining the relationship between *ingenium* and *virtus* S. distinguishes *bonae artes* and *malae artes* (2.5, 3.3, 10.4) and uses the distinction to differentiate the *vir bonus* and the *vir ignavus*, both of whom possess *ingenium* but who exercise their talent in different ways—either *bonis artibus* or *dolis atque fallaciis*, 11.2.

S. was followed in his use of *bonae-malae artes* by Livy, e.g. 24.4.2, 37.54.19 (*bonae artes*) and 2.9.8, 23.2.2, 25.1.4 (*malae artes*), and by Tacitus, e.g. *Hist.* 1.10.2, 1.17.2, etc., *Ann.* 1.9.3, 2.73.3 etc. See further Earl, chs. 1-4.

iter: more clearly expressed in *BJ* 1.3 *ad gloriam virtutis via grassatur.*

3.1. **pulchrum est ... multi laundantur:** up to this point S. has put forward the principle *virtus-gloria* as a general rule applicable to all men engaged in any type of activity. His prime occupation, however, is with the field of politics. This is shown by his early application (in 1.5-2.6) of the general principle to the area of government; he also has in mind a statement of his own position and plans which appears in 3.3. Now, therefore, he narrows the wide field of individual human endeavour to the specific field of government. While he still maintains that all men in every

occupation have a share in *virtus* he accepts that the highest *virtus* lies in the exercise of the *ingenium* in the service of the state and that from this proceeds the highest form of *gloria*. This is the arena of activity to which he confines himself for the rest of the monograph. One of his immediate problems will be to show that the activity of history-writing both deserves a claim to *virtus* and is at the same time an exercise of *ingenium* in the highest field of endeavour, service to *res publica*.

bene facere: *factis egregiis de re publica mereri* (Kritz). The idea is brought out more clearly in 8.5. The expression is also used by Cato, 24.15, 37.21J.

bene facere ... bene dicere: the meaning of the sentence is clear: "to serve one's country is glorious, but even to praise it is not unacceptable". However, comment on the passage has been based on the assumption that the meaning is unclear. Thus Leeman, *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954) 323-39, assumes *rei publicae* to be understood after *dicere*, 'to speak well to the advantage of the state', and maintains that the reference is to oratory and the forum, an arena of activity quite clearly equated with military service on behalf of the state by Cicero in *pro Mur.* 30; and that the statement *vel pace vel bello clarum fieri licet* fits in with this twofold division of service. This explanation involves an illogical progression of thought: there is a considerable difference between giving good service to the state through oratory (*bene dicere*) and describing the good service of others (*facta aliorum scribere*). It also involves a shift in the meaning of *facere*, as *bene facere* is made to refer to military exploits as opposed to civilian service, while *fecere* and *facta* must include the latter.

Additions such as *rei publicae, in re publica, de re publica* do not help in this case. The question that should be asked is whether a desire for word-play has led S. to write nonsense. This indeed seems to be the case. Such a contention may be argued in one of two ways. Either (i), since it is not the function of a historian *bene dicere de re publica* or anything of the kind, but, as is so often emphasised by the historians themselves and by others (e.g. Cicero) *verum dicere*, without fear or favour, S. has got himself into a great muddle of thought. Or (ii), since, without necessarily deserting the truth, a historian may choose *celebrare res nobiles, bene gestas* etc. (cf. esp. Livy), S., carried away by the desire to play with words, has carelessly singled out one aspect of historical writing as if this were history all in all.

There is, however, no doubt about S.'s intention: he is maintaining that both *facere* and *dicere-scribere* are an exercise of the *ingenium* which is true *virtus*, and the standard of achievement is *gloria*, variously expressed as *pulchrum, haud absurdum, clarum fieri, laudantur*. The idea gets more concise and clear expression in *BJ* 2.4 *quom praesertim tam multae variaeque sint artes animi, quibus summa claritudo paratur.*

haud absurdum: an archaic combination cf. *Thes. LL.* 6.2558.76ff.). *Haud* is a favourite word with S. Cf. 13.5, 14.5, 23.1, 23.4, 25.3 etc. Wackernagel, 2.256 shows that the word had become somewhat rare. Its presence in Livy and Tacitus may be due to the influence of S. or may indicate the persistence of the word in historical writings as such. Cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 244V. A litotes such as *haud absurdum* is used several times by S., e.g. 23.1: *natus haud obscuro loco*, 60.3 *haud timidi resistunt*. Cf. Livy, 37.16.12; Cicero, *Har. Resp.* 55.

vel pace vel bello: where these words occur separately *in* with the abl. is used, e.g. 2.3 *in pace* ... *in bello*; 9.4. Where an attribute is added the preposition is omitted, e.g. 51.5 *bello Macedonico*; 51.6, 52.30, 59.3. This latter rule may also apply to a doublet expression such as this.

3.2. **ac mihi quidem ... pro falsis ducit:** in this and the preceding sentence S. takes up one of the traditional *topoi* of an *exordium*, i.e. *de historia* (G. Engel, *De antiquorum* ... *prooemiis*, Diss. Marburg, 1910). He has blended it into his treatment of his main principle, *virtus-gloria*. It is now his task to show that his choice of an arena for the exercise of *ingenium*, viz. historiography, is a recognised field for *virtus*. He emphasises that *gloria* is the fruit of exertion in this field and goes into unusual detail to show that historiography involves *industria* or *labor*, one of the *bonae artes* embraced by the concept of *virtus* (2.5). He concedes that while the exertion involved is significant the *gloria* which attends it is hardly of the same calibre as that attained in the primary field of endeavour, active participation in public affairs.

An important difference of emphasis between this statement and the sentiments later expressed in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* should be noted. In *BJ* 4.1 we have *ceterum ex aliis negotiis, quae ingenio exercentur, in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum*, and in 4.4 *maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae venturum* (cf. 4.5-6). Here we have boldly stated that an added claim for historiography is the fact that it was useful.

Leeman, by assuming *rei publicae* to be understood after *bene dicere* (3.1), rejects the statement of Pöschl (*Grundwerte r. Staatsgesinnung in d. Gesch. d. S.*, Berlin, 1940, 36), of Knoche (*Ph.* 89 (1934) 115), and of Rambaud (*REL* 24 (1946) 124) that the idea of usefulness to the state is completely lacking in the prologue of *Bellum Catilinae*. As will become evident from his statement in 4.1-2, S. considers that the activity of the historian is comparable to service to the state in an official capacity; that historiography is merely a continuation of his earlier political activity. While this may imply the idea of *usus reipublicae*, it seems clear that in this prologue the emphasis is on personal *gloria* and is concerned almost wholly with showing that historiography is *labor* which can justly be included under the heading of *virtus*. In the changed circumstances which attended the writing of *Bell. Jug.* the writing of history is substituted for an active political career as the only way to achieve *gloriam virtutis via*.

For treatments of the differences in content and emphasis between the two prologues with regard to the usefulness of historiography see H. Oppermann, *NJ* 11 (1935) 47-53, *Gymnasium* 65 (1958) 185-96; K. Vretska, *Gymnasium* (1937) 24-43; Büchner, 111ff.; Egermann, *SAWW* 214, 3 (1932) 26f.

ac mihi quidem: S. turns from the general to the particular and applies the generalised principle he has hitherto expounded to his own choice of historiography as a field for the display of *virtus*.

haudquaquam par gloria ... in primis arduom: the emphasis is on the personal reputation resulting from his activity, and on the idea that historiography is a *labor*, demanding *industria*.

haudquaquam: is also used by Livy, and has an archaic flavour (Kroll, 304). Cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 289V. Livy, too, emphasises the magnitude of the task he has undertaken, but his sense of being oppressed arises mainly from the very size of the work contemplated. See Ogilvie, 24.

auctorem: the MSS offer both *auctorem* and *actorem*. The fact that *auctor rerum* is elsewhere used almost in the sense "historian", e.g. Cicero, *Brut.* 44, *Leg.* 2.15, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.3, Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.30.2, and is therefore equivalent to S.'s *scriptor rerum*, has influenced some commentators. *Auctor* primarily means an agent who is the cause of his own acts; cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.194 *neque actor essem*

alienae personae, sed auctor meae, pro Sest. 61; Caesar, *BC* 1.26.4 *illo auctore atque agente*. S. has elsewhere (1.6) distinguished between the planning of an act and its execution, and here *auctor* is used to indicate both the originator and executor of an act rather than a mere agent. Cf. *Thes. LL.* 1.445.72ff.; 2.1204.5ff.

in primis arduom . . . exequenda sunt: the number of close parallels quoted for this passage—Isocrates, *Paneg.* 13 (Wirz, Perrochat, Bolaffi), Thucydides, 2.35.2 (Perrochat, Bolaffi), Ephorus, the model behind Diodorus, *Prol.* 1.2.7 (Leeman) underlines the inadvisability of restricting S. to a specific source (Appendix II).

quod facta dictis exequenda sunt: three important codices, A, K, H, read *exequenda*, supported by Gellius (4.15.2, Codd. V, P, R.). The majority of codices have *exaequanda*, a reading also suggested in Jerome, *vit. Hilar.* 1. If full and elaborate representation of material is S.'s meaning, the selection of *exequenda* by Kritz, Kurfess and others is justifiable: *ex(s)equi* carries the meaning *aliquid verbis vel scriptis exponere, explicare, describere* (*Thes. LL.* 5.1853). But something more is intended, and *exaequanda* is to be preferred. It was a commonplace of ancient historiography that objectivity was taken for granted in historical writing (Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.62); *naturally* there is no falsification in history writing: *haec scilicet fundamenta nota sunt omnibus, ipsa aedificatio posita est in rebus et verbis* . . . S. is referring to two criteria of Hellenistic historiography—that history is primarily a moral lesson, to give praise to virtue and blame to vice (cf. Theopompus, and Ephorus), and therefore the dramatic tension of the events should be reproduced in the language itself; note the manifesto of Duris of Samos, *FGH* 76, fr.1. Cf. Diodorus' (20.43.7) criticism of the deficiencies of history: it is impossible for the writer to convey the simultaneity of the events: ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν τῶν πεπραγμένων τὸ πάθος ἔχειν, τὴν δ' ἀναγραφὴν ἐστηρημένην ὁμοίας ἐξουσίας μιμεῖσθαι μὲν τὰ γεγενημένα, πολὺ δὲ λιπεῖσθαι τῆς ἀληθοῦς διαθέσεως. This is exactly S.'s problem—to give the ἀναγραφή the immediacy and effect of the πάθος. *Exaequanda* conveys the nature of his problem.

dein quia: nearly all codices read *dehinc*, and it should be retained. *dein* is supported only by Gellius, 4.15.2. There is firmer MS support for *dein* at *BJ* 5.1, 19, 6 where, however, *dehinc* is still a strong transmission. *dehinc* in enumeration is not unusual; cf.

Virgil, *Geo.* 3.166-7; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.34.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 49.3.

quia plerique . . . dicta putant: erroneously taken by Bolaffi (*Athenaeum* 16 (1938) 152) as a remark, independent of his models, made by S. to prepare for the specific difficulties of his subject matter, the career of Catiline. It is a doctrine of the rhetorical schools. See below.

quae delicta . . . dicta putant: there is a looseness of construction here. We should expect: *quae in delictis reprehendendis dixeris, malevolentia . . . dicta putant.*

ubi de magna virtute . . . pro falsis ducit: taken to have originated from Thucydides, 2.35.2 (Wirz, Perrochat, Bolaffi). But K. Vretska, *Er.* 53 (1953) 41-60 has shown that we are here dealing with a doctrine of the schools of rhetoric. To support his opinion he refers to Isocrates, *Evag.* 6; Demosthenes, *Epitaph.* 14; Nepos, *Chabr.* 3.3 and especially *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.50 and Quintilian, 11.1.15f. At the basis of the doctrine lies a recognition of a general characteristic of mankind, the psychological basis on which man either praises or blames descriptions of human achievement. Either he refuses to recognise achievement because he believes himself by implication to be censured (Isocrates, *Antid.* 146; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.1.2f.) or he places no limit to his praise (Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.342ff., *Off.* 2.36; cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1095a.25f.).

malevolentia et invidia: added, according to S., by the reader as a motive in the historian, whereas in Thucydides the difficulty of arriving at an adequate description is ascribed to the envy which is part of human nature and exists in the reader. Büchner (116f.) seeing this aspect as the chief claim to *labor-industria* involved in historiography, rightly rejects Leeman's (*Mnemosyne*, 7, 331) suggestion that the reference is to the danger of *superbia* in the writer.

memores: the generalising subjunctive as in 1.6. *Memorare* is a word often used by Plautus as a substitute for *dicere*, e.g. *Poen.* 1063, *Trin.* 883, *Amph.* 1117, etc. It is used in the same way in old poetry, e.g. Ennius, *Ann.* 36, 111, 356, 538-9V, in Cato, 37.20J, and in Lucretius, e.g. 1.831, 2.630, 5.320.

Since S. has already used *dictis-dicta*, his use of *memores* is possibly to be expected. He uses two constructions with *memorare*, either *de* + abl., as in 26.3, 52.13, or the simple accus. as in 5.7, 20.1.

supra ea: best explained as a case of brachylogy for *ea quae supra ea sunt.* See Introd. p. 16

3.3-4.2. **sed ego adulescentulus ... animus liber erat:** another traditional *topos* of an *exordium—de persona.*

Having established that historiography can be a substitute for practical activity in politics and therefore a proper arena for the exercise of *virtus*, S. now proceeds to explain his reasons for choosing historiography. His decision is the result of personal experience and external event. Because of the corrupt state of public morals he is denied the path to *gloria* by ways of *praeclarum facinus* in active politics; he will now strive for the same goal by *artes bonae* (*labor, aequitas, continentia*) implied in historiography.

Several aspects of this autobiographical section deserve attention:

(i) The undoubted contradiction between the facts of S.'s life as a public official and the apparently serious tone of high moral purpose both here and in his treatment of his theme has been dealt with in the Introduction, p. 21f.

(ii) Another difference may be noted between the prologue of *Bellum Jugurthinum* and this prologue (see on 3.2 above). In *BC* 3.3-5 personal reasons are given for the decision to change from practical politics to the writing of history; the state is mentioned only as the arena within which one practises the *virtus* represented by historiography. In *BJ* 3.1, on the other hand we read: *verum ex iis magistratus et imperia, postremo omnis cura rerum publicarum minume mihi hac tempestate cupiunda videntur, quoniam neque virtuti honos datur neque illi, quibus per fraudem iis fuit uti, tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt.* Here the reason for the rejection of public life is explicitly stated as being the degenerate condition of *respublica.* While in the *BC* there is assumed to be a parity between the activity of the statesman and that of the historian, in the *BJ* politics as a practical career are bluntly discarded. See further H. Oppermann, *NJ* 11 (1935) 47-53; K. Vretska, *Gymnasium,* (1937) 24-43.

(iii) Despite a gradual change in the Roman attitude to *gloria*, hitherto centred on official activity, and the acceptance of the possibility of its attainment in non-political fields (U. Knoche, *Ph.* (1934) 102ff., esp. 117f.), S. still felt compelled to justify his decision. Although, as Syme (43) points out, S. could have done so by quoting pertinent examples from a respectable line of Roman annalists, his obsession with the idea of *otium* and the manner of its abuse in his own day undoubtedly made it important for him that he should not be classed as a degenerate. The idea of the

misuse of *otium* is an important element of his theme (cf. 52.5, 52.28). There may also be present the wish to proclaim clearly, in view of the atmosphere of intrigue and suspicion prevalent in the contemporary political scene, that he had no intention of re-entering public life. On this see K. Latte, *NWzA*, 2R.H4, Leipzig, 1935.

(iv) A striking feature of this passage is the conceptual and verbal parallelism it shows with Plato's 7th Epistle. Plato's work, which explains in some detail the philosopher's reasons for abandoning involvement in practical politics and turning to the realm of pure reasoning, is the only discernible source for S.'s personal confession here. The apparent concentration on a single source in this segment has led Egermann (*SAWW* 214, 3 (1932)) to assume that Plato was a major source for S. in the prologue as a whole. It is clear that there are striking parallels with the 7th Epistle in this case, but it must be pointed out that S. here, as elsewhere, uses his Greek model for his own purposes. He remodels his prototype according to the actual state of affairs. His failure in politics is represented as a personal disaster and the theoretical pursuit with which he replaces his former practice is the writing of history, not philosophy. He undoubtedly welcomed the opportunity to place his experience under such distinguished a precedent as that of Plato, but his handling of this situation is personal and Roman throughout.

For further insight into this aspect compare Egermann, *op. cit.* and Vretska, *Eranos* 53 (1955) 41-60. W. Schur, *Klio* 11 (1936) 60-75, reiterates against Egermann's thesis the view, already expressed in his *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, that Posidonius is S.'s major source.

3.3. **sed ego adulescentulus ... advorsa fuere:** introduces the *topos, de persona*, which is often used for personal praise and the disparagement of rivals; cf. Theopompus in Dion. Hal. 1.1. Here, S., in a significantly unique way, uses it for self accusation. Note the close verbal parallelism to Plato, *Ep.* 7.324b νέος ἐγώ ποτε ὢν πολλοῖς δὴ ταὐτὸν ἔπαθον· ᾠήθην ... ἐπὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῆς πόλεως εὐθὺς ἰέναι· καί μοι τύχαι τινὲς τῶν τῆς πόλεως πραγμάτων τοιαίδε παρέπεσον.

adulescentulus: Varro (apud Serv. *ad Aen.* 5.295) divides the ages of man into *infantiam, pueritiam, adulescentiam, iuventam, senectam*, and (apud Censorinum, *De Die Nat.* 14) puts the limit of *adulescentia* as 15-30 years. Isidorus, *Orig.* 11.2.4 fixes the limits

as 14-28 years. The terms, *adulescens*, *adulescentia*, are however used quite loosely; they are often employed to indicate not so much years of age as the period of the flower and vigour of manhood. Cf. 5.2, 38.1; Cicero, *Off.* 1.122, 2.45, 2.49; Nepos, *Eum.* 1.4, *Attic.* 8.2; Tactitus, *Ann.* 1.46.1, 1.47.2. This lack of precision is also true of *adulescentulus*; cf. 49.2 where Caesar at 37 years of age is so designated. It may be that the diminutive indicates a somewhat younger age than *adulescens*; cf. Cicero, *ad Brut.* 26.3 *pro adulescentulo ac paene puero*. However S.'s use of *adulescentulus* here probably also carries the connotation of the innocent, the naive, the stupid, conveying the feelings of a mature and disillusioned man looking back to the beginning of his career. See Axelson, *Mélanges Marouzeau*, Paris, 1948, 7ff.

sicuti plerique: there is a tacit limitation in *plerique*, since patently the great majority of young Romans did not go in for politics. The limitation is to youths of the class which normally provided Rome's politicians. Although he did not come from this class but from the far wider class of the well-to-do, of whom the majority did not go in for politics, S. thinks of himself as if he had belonged to the governing class from the start. It was a form of self-deception not uncommon amongst 'new men' at Rome.

One might just wonder whether this could be an early case of the weakening of the sense of *plerique* which is found in Tacitus, viz. "many", "very many", not "the great majority". On the whole, this seems unlikely.

studio ... latus sum: "I was led by zeal to enter public affairs". *Studio* is a normal abl. of instrument; cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.1.3 *mihi studium fuit adulescentulo rem publicam capessere*. The emendation *a studio* (Kritz), based on 4.2, is unnecessary.

ibique: see Introd. p. 14f. for parataxis as an element of S.'s style.

nam pro pudore ... vigebant: with this antithetical arrangement of concepts S. orientates the moral point of view from which he analysed his public career. The *bonae-malae artes* of 2.5 are added to, and he will draw on these concepts continually to expound his views on Roman history and on the Catilinarian conspiracy.

See Introd. p. 14 on the asyndeton of *audacia largitia avaritia*. It is a feature which occurs in Cato, e.g. 25.9, 27.1, 41.7J; in Plautus, e.g. *Most.* 46, *Pers.* 124, *Rud.* 297-8, and in legal phraseology, e.g.

Dessau, *ILS*, 1634 *auri argenti aeris*. See further Leo, *Kl. Schr.* 1.163ff.

3.4. **quae tametsi ... malarum artium:** cf. Plato, *Ep.* 7.325a ἃ δὴ πάντα καθορῶν καὶ εἴ τιν' ἄλλα τοιαῦτα οὐ σμικρά, ἐδυσχέρανά τε καὶ ἐμαυτὸν ἐπανήγαγον ἀπὸ τῶν τότε κακῶν. For the *constructio ad sensum* in '*quae*' see Introd. p. 16 and for this feature in general see L-H-S, 435ff.

conrupta: to be taken as nominative (= "led astray"). Cf. what S. has to say elsewhere concerning *ambitio*, e.g. 10.5, 11.2, 52.22, 52.26. This agreement with *aetas* is confirmed by the following statement: while he succumbed to *honoris cupido* he disassociated himself from the *mali mores* of his contemporaries. Dietsch's interpretation of *conrupta* as abl. agreeing with *ambitione* is less satisfactory.

3.5. **relicuorum:** the alternative reading, *reliquis*, is impossible. Cf. *ego ... sicuti plerique*; *eadem quae ceteros*; these are stultified if *reliquis* is read. Moreover, who introduces *orum* before *-is*? But any scribe would make *-orum -is* into *-is -is*.

eadem quae ceteros fama: several interpretations of this sentence have been proposed, some of the text as it stands, others involving emendations.

Ernout's rendering, *cupido eadem quae ceteros famā atque invidiā*: "my desire for glory was at great as theirs, and it plagued me by bringing me into disrepute", makes sound sense. Some (e.g. Summers) have preferred the alternative reading, supported by very few MSS, *eādem qua ceteros famā*: "tormented me with the same evil repute and odium with which it tormented others". Since the MS readings yield good sense, emendations should be treated with caution, even one as good as Damsté's (*Mnemosyne* 1893, 215f.) change of *cupido* into *cupidum*.

fama atque invidia: Kritz correctly warns against taking this as hendiadys for *invidiosa fama*. Each word should be given its proper weighting; *fama* meaning *mala fama*, and *invidia* the envy aroused by young upstarts aspiring to and attaining office.

4.1. **igitur ubi animus ... aetatem agere:** to justify his decision to write history S. puts forward a reason which is couched in terms of contempt and indignation, a reason which because of its apparently un-Roman character has aroused a variety of reactions among commentators.

First, S. deals with the idea of *otium—non fuit consilium ...*

otium conterere. It was a concept which had to be explained and justified to Roman minds. Thus Cicero, defending his writing of *de Officiis* to occupy the time of his forced retirement from public life, calls upon the support of the illustrious elder Scipio and reports his saying: *nunquam se minus otiosum esse quam cum otiosus esset* (3.1); Cicero goes on to interpret: *illum et in otio de negotiis cogitare.* Similarly, in *pro Planc.* 66 Cicero reports on Cato's remark at the beginning of his *Origines*: *clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem extare oportere,* words which indicate that Cato evidently viewed his history as a justification to the Roman people for his *otium.* S. therefore is placing himself on a par with illustrious predecessors, in that his *otium* is really a matter of being *intentus negotio.*

However, S. immediately proceeds to attack two contemporary forms of the exercise of *otium,* farming and hunting. The traditional Roman attitude to agriculture is represented by Cato, *RR Praef.* 2 *et virum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant bonum agricolam bonumque colonum.* It was an attitude which persisted: *omnium autem rerum ex quibus aliquid acquiritur, nihil est agri cultura melius, nihil uberius, nihil dulcius, nihil homine libero dignius* (Cicero, *Off.* 1.151; cf. *id., de Senect.* 51; Varro, *RR* 1.2.3). Syme's view (43f.) that S. is criticising farming and hunting as having degenerated respectively into profiteering by use of slave labour and a mere fashionable exercise does not provide a satisfactory explanation of the Sallustian expression *servilibus officiis* "occupations fit only for slaves". Several scholars, e.g. Latte, Oppermann, Vretska, have accepted without comment the view of H. Peter, *Wahrheit und Kunst,* Leipzig, 1911, 340, that S.'s attitude arises out of an unthinking imitation of his Greek sources. Egermann, *SAWW,* 214.3 (1932) 78 is more specific; he nominates Plato's *Republic* as the source wherein farmers and tradesmen are allotted a subservient role to soldiers and statesmen in the organisation of the state. The weakening of the attitude of unquestioning respect for agriculture and the tendency to couple γεωργός and δημιουργός especially in political and economic contexts appears in Plato, *Rep.* 415a σίδηρον δὲ καὶ χαλκὸν τοῖς γεωργοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δημιουργοῖς, in *Leg.* 806d γεωργίαι δὲ ἐκδεδομέναι δούλοις, *Gorg.* 518a; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1329a, 26; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.8.4. Leeman's (*Mnemosyne* 7 (1954) 334) rejection of the source theory on the grounds that hunting was never thus demeaned in Greek

literature places too much emphasis on the individual concepts of S.'s doublets *colundo aut venando* ... Thus in his reading S. came across sentiments which fitted in not only with the political background of his statement but with his attitude to the *otiosi* of his time. Carelessness and prejudice account for his choice of words, which may in fact have been intended simply to indicate that by his time agriculture had lost the esteem it once enjoyed as *ars liberalis*, an occupation fit for a free Roman. Cf. Cicero's interpretation of a line in Terence (*Heaut.* 69) referring to farming: *non enim illum ab industria sed ab illiberali labore deterret* (*Fin.* 1.3; cf Aristotle, *Pol.* 1337b, 18ff.).

ubi animus ... requievit ... et decrevi: a change of subject characteristic of the unwieldy period-structure of early Latin. See F. Eckstein for examples from Plautus and Cato (*Ph.* 77 (1921) 148ff). Cf. Kroll, 285.

ex multis miseriis: on the analogy of *se recipere* (*a strepitu*, Livy; *a luctu*, Tacitus) *requiescere* = "get rid of" is used with prepositions that express separation from.

aetatem ... habendam: cf. 51.12 *qui ... vitam habent.* For the sake of *variatio* S. uses *vitam* (*aetatem*) *habere* as well as the more usual *vitam agere*. His use of *habere* here is further influenced by *procul* (*procul ... habere*) and the fact that he uses *aetatem agere* a few lines below.

decrevi: cf. 35.2, 58.14, *BJ* 4.3. A word generally used only for solemn pronouncements of senatorial decrees etc.; e.g. 43.3, 50.1, 51.18 etc.

bonum otium: contrast Catullus, 51.13-16 (Fordyce's note). The adjective is used to emphasise once again that for S. *otium*, i.e. withdrawal from public affairs, still leaves opportunity for the attaining of *fama*. For a connection of *otium* with *desidia* cf. Cicero, *Acad.* 1.23, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.78; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.71.1; A. J. Woodman, *Latomus* 25 (1966) 217-26.

conterere: when found with expressions of time *conterere* can mean *transigere* in a good sense, cf. Cicero, *de Amic.* 104; Propertius, 2.1.46. It is more often, however, as here, used in a sense of wasting, cf. Terence, *Hecyr.* 815; Lucretius, 3.1047; Propertius, 1.7.9; Livy, 1.57.5 (Ogilvie's note).

colundo aut venando: depending on *intentum*; see 2.9 n. *intentum*. Madvig's observation that these gerunds must be ablative as there is no certain instance in prose of the dative gerund govern-

ing an accusative is not a valid one; cf. Varro, *LL.* 5.137 *alligando fasces*; Livy, 21.54.1 *equites ... tegendo*. Such instances were bound to be rare, but the exception here is justified.

servilibus officiis: in apposition to the preceding gerunds and normally rendered "servile occupations". Some, to avoid accusing S. of an unRoman outlook, render the phrase "mere corporeal pursuits" and refer back to the expression in 1.2 *corporis servitio*. Such an interpretation of *servilis* is wholly out of the question.

aetatem agere: cf. 37.6, 39.2, 51.12, 58.13. An archaic expression. Cf. *Thes. LL.* 1.1124.75; Introd. p. 18f.

4.2. **incepto studioque:** included by Skard (Introd. p. 18) in his list of synonym doublets. But there is a clear distinction of meaning between *incepto* ("beginning, attempt, undertaking") and *studio* ("study"). In effect the two words constitute a hendiadys: "from that study which I then began". Note the difference from *studio* of 3.3.

a quo incepto ... eodem: the relative clause precedes its antecedent and the noun is contained in the relative clause; *eodem* is, of course, an adverb.

ambitio mala: *ambitio* here is equivalent to *honoris cupido* of 3.5. At 11.1 S. maintains that *virtus* and *ambitio* are alike in having as their goals *gloria, honos, imperium*; they differ only in the means used to attain these goals. Hence the adjective, which makes the phrase equivalent to *ambitio quae malum affert*, is used to make his meaning quite clear.

res gestas populi Romani: cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 1.1M *res populi Romani ... militiae et domi gestas composui*; Livy, *Praef.* 1.

carptim: "selectively", in the same sense as used by Pliny, *Ep.* 8.4.7; Tactitus, *Hist.* 4.46.4. S.'s meaning is made clear by the following *ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur* which places it within the tradition of earlier historiography; cf. Cato, 3.13J; Livy, *Praef.* 3; 7.2.2; Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.8.1. Nonius' use of *strictim* instead of *carptim* in his quotation of this sentence (824L) is rightly rejected by Kritz on the grounds that it simply means *breviter* and cannot strictly be used with *perscribere* (*accurate scribere, nulla re graviore omissa*).

S. was the first after Coelius Antipater to write monographs (*RE* IV.185ff.). For a brief discussion of the theory of the monograph as formulated in Cicero's letter to Lucceius (*Fam.* 5.12) and the irony, in the circumstances, of S.'s selection of his topic see Syme, 57f.

mihi a spe . . . animus liber erat: a traditional claim of historians. Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.1 *sed incorruptam fidem professis neque amore quisquam et sine odio dicendus est*; *Ann.* 1.1 *sine ira et studio*; Sallust, *Hist.* 1.6M *neque me diversa pars in civilibus armis movit a vero.* See Goodyear on Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.1.3.

partibus: sometimes, as in 37.10, *BJ* 40.2-3, 42.5, 43.1, 73.4, where the context demands it, S. uses *partes* as equivalent to "parties" in the political sense. See K. Hanell, *Er.* 43 (1945) 263-76.

4.3. **igitur de Catilinae . . . absolvam:** introduces the *topos* —*de materia*. Cf. Thucydides, 1.1; Livy, *Praef.* 1.

quam verissume potero: S.'s claim to the truth is discussed in Appendix III. Cf. Thucydides, 1.22.2.

paucis absolvam: S. several times expresses an intention to be brief, e.g. 5.9, 38.3. Brevity was a feature of his style remarked upon by ancient commentators (Introd. p. 14ff.). For brevity of treatment see further on 4.4. His admiration for Cato undoubtedly influenced him: thus of Cato he says: *Romani generis disertissimus paucis absolvit* (*Hist.* 1.4M); cf. the scholiast on Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.9.

For the phrase, *paucis absolvam*, cf. 38.3, *BJ* 17.2, *Hist.* 1.4M; Livy, 33.12.2. It is equivalent to *expediam, disseram* of other writers (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.48.1) and occurs elsewhere only in tragedy, e.g. Pacuvius, 181R. Its presence in Livy may indicate its persistence in historiography.

Absolvere is here used with *de*; elsewhere (38.3, *BJ* 17.2) it is used with the accusative.

4.4. **nam id facinus . . . novitate:** this reason for selection of topic is parralleled by *BJ* 5.1 *primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit* (cf. Thucydides, 1.1), but there is no second reason stated here equivalent to *dein quia tunc superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est* (*ibid.*).

The words *ego memorabile* pick up *memoria digna* of 4.2. This justification of choice of subject is something more than a mere mechanical repetition of the traditional motif of *bellum maxime omnium memorabile,* which came down to Polybius (1.2.11) through Thucydides (1.1.2) and Herodotus (7.20). While he will describe the conspiracy as a historical event his treatment of it will be influenced by his conception of *sceleris atque periculi novitas* inherent in it. The stress laid on these aspects of the conspiracy together with his intention *paucis absolvere* means that the selection

of material, the description of specifically chosen facts, the placing of emphasis become doubly important. It also means that a completeness in subject matter need not necessarily be expected. See Appendix III.

facinus: see 2.9 n. *facinus*.

4.5. **de quoius hominis moribus:** a transitional passage to introduce his portrait of Catiline. The concentration on *mores* here and in the sketch which follows connects introduction and narrative within the same framework and emphasises the point of view from which S. regards the chief personage of his monograph and the action in which he is involved; the *mores* of Catiline and the causes thereof play a decisive role in the history of the conspiracy.

prius explananda sunt, quam ... faciam: the use of the subjunctive (*faciam*) should be noted. It is not used in the parallel passage in the *Bell. Jug.* (5.3) *sed prius quam ... expedio ... repetam*. The difference is in the *explananda sunt* as opposed to the *repetam* of the *BJ* passage. Where the *priusquam* clause precedes, indicative or subjunctive is possible. Where the *priusquam* clause follows, the *priusquam* can be considered a statement of fact only when it follows a statement of fact. After a statement of necessity (*explananda*) the *priusquam* clause is considered ideal, not factual.

5.1-8: *Character-sketch of Catiline*

The placing at this point of the first of two portraits of Catiline (see ch. 15 for the second) requires some explanation. The content of the characterisation on this first occasion offers some guidance. It is a highly compressed statement of the potentials present in both Catiline himself and in the period of which he is a typical, if extreme, example. This embraces both moral and political factors. As the ensuing narrative will show it is the moral aspect which emerges more powerfully, and this is in keeping with the special point of view of Roman-Hellenistic historiography, according to which the deterioration of Rome from the middle of the 2nd cent. B.C. was primarily due to the degeneration of morals and the debasement of mankind.

The connection between this portrait and the excursus on Roman history which follows (chs. 6-13) is generally recognised. The excursus is a description of the moral climate which made the

conspiracy inevitable. What is less generally recognised is the connection between this picture of Catiline and what has gone before (Appendix I). Yet it is clear that this character study is connected with the concept of *virtus-gloria* which S. has already dealt with and has applied to individuals engaged in public life. By his method of antithesis, of presenting at each stage the opposite of the practice of *virtus* (e.g. 2.5, 2.8, 3.3-5) he has prepared for the emergence of such a creature as Catiline, one who possesses, like all men, the potentialities which should lead to *bona fama*, but who perversely chooses the opposite vices.

Catiline's *magna vis et animi et corporis* made him ideally fitted for the achieving of *egregia facinora*. But his *ingenium*, which is *malum pravumque*, results in his choosing the wrong means (cf. 11.2) to attain his ends. He is given over to *honoris cupido*, which is *ambitio*, and to *pecuniae cupido*, which is *avaritia*. Thus we have a direct linking up of this portrait with the general statements that preceded it. Various other concepts which serve to underline this conceptual connection will be dealt with in the commentary as they occur.

Several other aspects of this portrait of Catiline deserve our attention:

(i) The very generalised expression given to many of the concepts contained in this character study is in keeping with a technique of the Sallustian manner of exposition we have already noted. While this chapter provides a specific application of a general principle previously enunciated, it at the same time gives expression to generalised concepts which will receive a more detailed treatment in what follows. Thus though the emphasis is on moral forces —*mores, animus, cupido, lubido, luxuria, avaritia*—which control the narrative throughout, we have an intimation that other forces were also at work. Specifically, an economic factor (*inopia rei familiaris*) and the interplay of political forces and factions (*post dominationem L. Sullae*).

(ii) S.'s comprehensive glance at Catiline and the forces he represents illustrates a feature of his method and his viewpoint. The manner in which he gives expression to this becomes a feature of his style. He is interested in personalities and events only in so far as they are connected with the development of his main theme— the conspiracy as an outstanding example of the depth of deterioration to which *res publica* had descended. His treatment of people

and events is dictated by this principle. He is not aiming at a full historical treatment, but rather at using both persons and incidents as illustrative material for his theme. This will, partly at least, explain his selection of material, his grouping of events, his choosing of specific individuals for more detailed treatment. Stylistically, this finds expression in an almost breathless accumulation of facts, in layers of double and triple asyndeton, the accumulation of nouns and adjectives arranged in conjunction or in contradiction with each other, in an unmistakable emphasis on the leading concepts.

(iii) Such a method and such a style have received both praise and blame. There are those who recognise in S's selection and grouping of words a high order of effectiveness, e.g. Perrochat, *REL* 13 (1935) 261-5. Others, represented by E. Howald, *Vom Geist antiker Geschichtsschreibung*, München, 1944, 150, reproach S. with defective craftsmanship in description. This is, perhaps, to measure S. by the standards of anecdotal biography; see, e.g. W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, München, 1951, 74ff., with lit. cited. His objective is not vividness of description, but to achieve an understanding of events from the analysis of the personalities involved.

For an interesting, but perhaps over-elaborate treatment of S.'s character portraits in relation to the encomium-schemes of the schools of rhetoric, see Vretska, *SO* 31 (1955) 105-18. Caution should be used in accepting, in their entirety, the conclusions of L. Alheit, *NJA* 43 (1919) 17-54, whose full acceptance of the thesis that S. was a party-pamphleteer carried as a consequence the belief that S. characterised individuals as political types.

5.1-2. **L. Catilina ... iuventutem suam exercuit:** S.'s summary underlines the essential aspects of Catiline's career and character down to his return from Africa in 66 B.C. where the tale is taken up again in ch. 15.

S.'s use of the perfects (*fuit, exercuit*) indicates a statement of fact in the past; later, with the imperfects (*cupiebat* etc.) he moves into the realm of description. One gets the impression that he has chosen his facts to coincide with his previous line of thought. Thus he turns to Catiline's *ingenium*, his intellectual and moral potential in the practice of *virtus* and the attainment of *bonam famam*. He seems to discard the possibility of *praeclara facinora* in the field of public affairs (*ingenio malo pravoque*), even though Catiline,

being *nobili genere natus*, should have had a fair prospect of success in seeking public office.

Information on Catiline's early career is limited. He was among the staff of the consul Pompeius Strabo at the siege of Asculum in 89 (*CIL* I² 709 = *ILS* 8888), and from Cicero, *pro Cael.* 12 we learn that he possessed military talent of a high order. This connection with Strabo must have been a significant experience since Strabo was an early example, in the onslaught on constitutional government which marked the last century of the Republic, of the ruthless use of public money and military backing in the pursuit of private ambitions; cf., e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.21.2; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 4; Granius Licinianus, pp. 19.9, 21.8 (Flemisch); Orosius, 5.18.26. In the company of such a general the young Catiline would feel something of the new spirit of the age, a spirit which viewed political forces unscrupulously, with reference ultimately to personal advantage, one to which the preservation of traditional principles mattered less than personal ascendancy.

As a partisan of Sulla, Catiline himself put into practice much of what he had seen in the camp of Pompeius Strabo. From Cicero's *in Toga Candida*, as preserved and commented upon by Asconius (84.87.89.91C), the *Commentariolum Petitionis* 9 and Plutarch, *Sull.* 32.2, *Cic.* 10.2 we learn of a series of murders and adulteries on the part of Catiline. Such activities are referred to here only in summary; some expansion occurs in ch. 15. For the moment we are presented with the picture of a man whose career up to this time has been one of violence and outrage. See further *RE* IIA. 1693; Syme, 65f., 84f.

5.1. **nobili genere natus:** Catiline was of the *gens Sergia*, a patrician house. Little is known of his immediate ancestry. From *Comm. Pet.* 9 (*natus in patris egestate*) we know that Catiline's father was living in reduced circumstances. But his great-grandfather, M. Sergius Silus, played an outstanding role in the 2nd Punic War and reached the praetorship (Pliny, *NH* 7.104ff.; Livy, 32.27.7). The M. Sergius Silus who served as *legatus* to Aemilius Paulus in 168 B.C. (Livy, 44.40.5; cf. Drumann-Groebe, 5.412) was probably his grandfather. Virgil traces the Sergian house back to the Trojan Segestus (*Aen.* 5.121) and Juvenal speaks of both Catiline and Cethegus as descendants of ancient and noble families (8.231-2). See further on 31.7 n. *beneficia*.

magna vi et animi et corporis: a phrase applied to Mithridates

by Aurelius Victor, *de Vir. Ill.* 76.1. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2.45.6 borrows *ingenio malo pravoque.* Both borrowings testify to the powerfulness of the Sallustian expression.

malo pravoque: for the synonym doublet see Introd. p. 18. There is no need to look for a subltle distinction of meaning.

5.2 **huic ... fuere ... ibique ... exercuit:** parataxis. See Introd. p. 14f..

adulescentia ... iuventutem: see on *adulescentulus,* 3.3.

bella intestina caedes rapinae discordia: a summary reference to the Sullan period. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 1.23M *quippe vasta Italia rapinis, fuga, caedibus*; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.2.5. The combination *caedes-rapinae* occurs in Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.10, *de Dom.* 12, 89, and in Livy where it is used of Tarquinius (1.60.2), of the *decemvir* Appius Claudius (3.57.3) and of Cinna and Marius (*Epit.* 80). *Caedes* in Catiline's case could refer to the murders he is alleged to have committed as a consequence of Sulla's victory. See p. 110.

ibique: equivalent to *in quibus* (*rebus*). This use of an adverb to substitute for a pronoun with preposition occurs also in 20.8 where *ubi* = *apud quos*; *BJ* 14.22 *unde* = *a quo.* Cf. Livy, 1.24.2, 1.49.5; Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 29. A somewhat archaic usage, cf. *Thes. LL.* 7.148.61ff. See Introd. p. 19.

5.3. **patiens:** the verbal adjective, distinguished from the participle by its particular governing force; thus *patiens inediae* = "able to endure want of food", referring to a habit, *patiens inediam* = "suffering want of food", referring to a specific occasion. Cf. 7.4, *BJ* 44.1, 63.3. Livy uses very similar terms in describing Hannibal, 21.4.5.

In a context closely resembling this, Cicero uses *fames, frigus, sitis, vigiliae* (*in Cat.* 1.26, 2.9, 3.16), whereas S. prefers the older and rarer *inedia, algor.* The unusual singular *vigiliae* may be due to a striving after *concinnitas* (Introd. p. 14); cf. 15.4 *quietibus, BJ* 31.20 *bella atque paces,* 41.7 *gloriae triumphique.*

supra quam quoiquam credibile: *supra quam* = *ultra quam,* cf. Quintilian, 10.1.101. For details of these aspects of Catiline see Cicero, *pro Cael.* 13f. *Quisquam* and *ullus* are used for "any" in sentences in which a negative is expressed or understood. Comparative sentences such as this imply a negative; thus it is here implied that no one would believe it. Cf. 14.7 and see n. 52.11.

5.4. **animus audax ... simulator ac dissimulator:** the feature of *dissimulatio* which bedevilled contemporary politics

is given its basis in the *animus* which is seeking for its private ends. This aspect is applied to the deterioration of the Republic at 10.5 and underlined as a feature of the contemporary scene in 38.3. See A. R. Hands, *JRS* 49 (1959) 56-60.

varius: cf. Cicero, *pro Cael.* 14; Plutarch, *Cic.* 10.2.

quoius rei lubet: cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.1.4. Some MSS have trivialised the reading to *cuiuslibet rei* to conform with the increasing tendency to treat *quilibet* as one word.

simulator ac dissimulator: cf. Fronto's note (v.d.H 100). For the meaning cf. Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.516 *dissimulamus nota, simulamus ignota, ut Sallustius* etc. *Simulare* is to pretend to be what one is not; *dissimulare* to conceal what one is; in this case to pretend to virtues, to dissemble vices.

alieni adpetens sui profusus: Tacitus' use of similar contrasts was probably suggested by this, *Germ.* 31.4, *Hist.* 1.49.5. *Sui* is genitive of sphere, used here on the analogy of *prodigus*, of which *profusus* is an intensification. Cf. *egregius militiae, Hist.* 1.148M, *liberalis pecuniae, BC* 7.6.

satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum: on the chiasmus see Introd. p. 15. Here its use may be partially due to a desire to avoid a rhyming effect. Cf. 20.13 *mala res spes multo asperior*; 58.1 *neque ex ignavo strenuum neque fortem ex timido exercitum.*

eloquentiae: *loquentiae*, Probus' emendation (apud Gell. 1.15.18) is contradicted by the eloquence displayed by Catiline; cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 5.20.5. *Eloquentia* is used only once again, at 54.1. The adjective *eloquens* is never used. S.'s aversion from the normal and contemporary in vocabulary is shown by his use of *facundia* and *facundus* in their place. On the comparative rarity of *facundia* cf. *Thes. LL.* 6.157ff.

5.5. **vastus animus:** "insatiable". In speaking of Sulla, *BJ* 95.3, S. uses the phrase *animo ingenti*. As in the present passage, he avoids *magnus*, probably because *magnus animus* had traditionally the connotation of "high souled"; cf. U. Knoche, *Ph.* Suppl. 27 (1935); J. Heurgon, *BAGB*, 1949, 79-81. *Vastus*, which carries the required sense of "enormity", may also contain an element of the meaning inherent in *vastare*; cf. 15.4 *ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat.*

5.6. **hunc post dominationem ... quicquam pensi habebat:** those who support the theory that S. was a political propagandist interpret *post* here as a dating by S. of Catiline's *lubido rei publicae*

capiundae, and adduce this sentence as one proof of bias in S. It is taken as deliberate antedating in an attempt to produce the impression that Catiline was from his earliest years such a scoundrel that a man like Caesar could not possibly have associated with him, e.g. H. Last, *Mélanges Marouzeau*, Paris, 1948, 366f.

It is not possible to say precisely when Catiline initiated plans for a seizure of power. S., looking at it mainly from the moral aspect, could without distortion conclude *ex eventu* that the seeds of Catiline's conduct were sown thus early. At 11.4-7 he emphasises that the dictatorship of Sulla is precisely the point at which *luxuria* was added to *ambitio* and *avaritia* as a disruptive and degenerating force at Rome. In particular it was the younger set which was affected by this combination of vices (12.2). Catiline is viewed as representative of this *perdita iuventus*, out of whose ranks he will draw his strongest support (14.5, 16.1-3).

S.'s preference for a cause-effect rather than a chronological view of historical events is referred to in the introductory notes to chs. 6-13. Here it is part of his intention to establish clearly the relationship between the demoralising effects of Sulla's dictatorship and the particular manifestion of these which he is about to describe. This is not to say that S. believed or stated that Catiline's revolutionary designs were worked out thus early. In the sentences immediately following he points out that there were other factors involved, and in his later description of the conspiracy he shows that several other external factors, notably Catiline's ambitions for the consulship and his successive electoral defeats, have to be taken into account before the revolutionary plan emerged in its final form.

hunc ... invaserat ... quicquam pensi habebat: on the parataxis see Introd. p. 14f.

post dominationem: has been interpreted (see above) as equivalent to *ab eo tempore quo dominari coeperat*, and *post* has been rendered as "since the time that" on the analogy of 38.3 *post illa tempora*; *BJ* 5.4 *post magnitudinem nominis Romani*. But here it more probably has the meaning of "in the light of", "based on the precedent of". Cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 4.4.3 *post has miserias*; Nepos, *Attic.* 9.5 *post calamitatem versuram*.

L. Sullae: the autocracy of Sulla provided a tempting example for military and political adventurers. Moreover the effects of the Sullan experience still linger strongly in this latest attempt at a

coup; cf. 16.4 *Sullani milites*, 37.6 *Sullanae victoriae*; Lentulus (47.2 *ex libris Sibyllinis regnum Romae tribus Corneliis portendi* etc.) emerges as an associate of the Catilinarians.

quibus modis: another judgement *ex eventu*; Catiline tried first by constitutional means, via the consulship, later by revolutionary methods. Ogilvie (on Livy, 1.57.6 *miris modis*) points out that the use of *modis* with an adjective in the place of an adverb is very rare after Plautus and Terence. For S. it underlines the fact that Catiline made several attempts, and also provides a suitably archaic ring.

regnum: a word, for Roman ears, with loathsome connotations. Cf. Livy, 27.19.4 *regium nomen alibi magnum, Romae intolerabile esse.*

neque quicquam pensi habebat: a phrase never used by Cicero and Caesar; it seems to have begun with S. who substitutes *habeo* for *est mihi* in the Plautine expression (*Truc.* 765). *Pensi* depends on *neque quicquam* here as it does in 23.2, on *nihil* at 12.2 and *BJ* 41.9. The positive phrase *pensi habere* (e.g. Symmachus, *Ep.* 1.15.3) is a false archaism.

5.7-8. **agitabatur magis ... luxuria atque avaritia vexabant:** S. here admits the influence of other factors. These will be developed in more detail later; e.g. *inopia* at 14.2-3, 16.4, 20.7-8, 21.2 *et al.*; *conscientia scelerum* at 15.3-5; *conrupti civitatis mores* will receive a detailed analysis in the excursus which immediately follows.

5.7. **conscientia scelerum:** the idea of the torments inflicted on the soul by a bad conscience is fairly common in Greek literature. Cf. Euripides, *Or.* 395ff.

Men. τί χρῆμα πάσχεις; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος;
Or. ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδα δεῖν' εἰργασμένος.

Cf. also Democritus, fr. 297 Diels; Demosthenes, *de Fals. Leg.* 210; Isocrates, *Nicocl.* 59, *Phil.* 79; Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1166b. It was taken up by Cicero, e.g. *Parad.* 18, *Fin.* 1.51, *pro Rosc. Am.* 67, 2*Verr.* 2.89. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 562-3, 567 accounts for its introduction, which he regards as a blemish, by the necessity for S. to find a plausible reason for Catiline's activity where, for partisan reasons, he could not make use of the historical grounds for his actions, viz. the sudden withdrawal of the support of Crassus and Caesar. L. Alheit, *NJ* 42 (1919) 17-54 rightly rejects Schwartz's point but replaces it with an even less satisfactory

theory, viz. that the concept of conscience is introduced for artistic reasons to provide a contrast with Sulla who was successful because he had no problems with conscience. *Conscientia* is important in S.'s view of Catiline; its significance becomes clearer in 15.4.

quae utraque: *constructio ad sensum.* See Introd. p. 16

5.8. **incitabant praeterea . . . vexabant:** S. has already, in 3.5, laid stress on *ambitio*; here the emphasis is on *luxuria* and *avaritia.* The nature and effect of these vices will be analysed in fuller detail in chs. 10-13, and applied summarily to the contemporary scene in ch. 52.

quos . . . vexabant: *quos* refers to *mores,* not, as Cortius maintained, to *civitatis* understanding *civium* by synesis. *Vexare* can be applied to things which degenerate as a result of bad handling; cf. Gellius, 2.6.5f.

5.9. **Res ipsa hortari . . . disserere:** for a comment on a common view that the narrative of the conspiracy begins here see Appendix I. It should be noted that this short introduction to the excursus on early Roman history contains in summary the entire subject matter of the digression — *ut paulatim inmutata ex pulcherruma (atque optuma) pessuma ac flagitiosissuma facta sit.*

Res ipsa: "my theme demands". S.'s intention to view the conspiracy within the context of a general moral corruption makes it necessary for him to define his terms more closely and to illustrate their application in a general way. Those who view the excursus as an imitation of the *Archaeology* of Thucydides (1.1-19) would interpret *res* here as the practice of historiography. *Res* is such a vague word that its meaning, unless qualified by an adjective, must be gathered from its context. Thus Büchner renders *res* as "der Sachzusammenhang selbst", i.e. the immediate context, the character of Catiline. But *res* can be used also to refer to the theme in general, as it apparently does at *BJ* 17.1 *res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere* (cf. *BJ* 95.2). Moreover the content of chs. 6-13, while it does illuminate the environment and climate of thought which could produce a Catiline, is also crucial for understanding of the totality of causes which, in S.'s view, produced such a conspiracy.

hortari . . . supra repetere etc.: S. uses an adverbial infinitive instead of *ut* with *hortari, monere* (e.g. 52.3) and *postulare* (e.g. *BJ* 17.1) when the subject is not a personal one. Cato, 27.1J = *HRR*

1.108 *multa me dehortata sunt huc prodire*, is followed in his use of *dehortor* by S. at *BJ* 24.4. The earliest use we know of *hortari* in a similar construction is *Rhet. ad Her.* 2.28. See further L-H-S, 345f.

de moribus admonuit: this is the only use of *admonere de* in S.; elsewhere he employs the simple accusative, *BJ* 79.1 or the genitive, 21.4, *BJ* 95.2.

instituta . . . disserere: cf. Livy, *Praef.* 9. The triple form of the object of *disserere*—*instituta maiorum*; *quo modo . . . reliquerint*; *ut . . . facta sit*—has been taken as a notable example of S.'s fondness for variety of construction; see Introd. p. 15f., For a similar variety see Livy, 1.6.1 with *ostendit*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.39.6 with *miseratur*.

maiorum: S., as distinct from Plato, is working out his concepts in terms of an actual state. The *virtus* dealt with is interpreted throughout in terms of activity and the *sapientia* involved is the practical application of *ingenium* to concrete problems. Cf. 6.5, 9.5, 51.37 for an application in terms of the early Republic; this application is repeated in terms of the contemporary scene at 51.42, 53.4. This practical trait which marked the working of the Roman mind is made quite explicit in Cicero's treatise *de Rep.*, where Scipio deals in terms of a real state.

<atque optuma>: omitted by the best MSS, but adopted by most editors on the authority of Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 2.18f., which in this case confirms the reading of many *codices recentiores*. See G. Perl, *F & F* 33 (1959) 56-60. See 6.2 *ita brevi* where the text is also amended with the help of Augustine.

The reading recommends itself in that *pulcherruma atque optuma* stands in a chiastic relationship with *pessuma ac flagitiosissuma*, a form of expression characteristic of S.; we find a very similar usage in 10.6. A further recommendation is S.'s liking for doublet expressions, and his use elsewhere of the combination *bonus* (or *magnus*)-*pulcher* (20.3, 52.20), very likely suggested by Cato's usage, 25.7, 28.4J.

Chs. 6-13: *The Excursus on Roman History*

Some general features of this survey of Roman history may be noted here. Significant aspects are documented in greater detail in the notes below.

(i) This digression should be taken as further introductory matter in which S. expands and analyses the moral concepts

within the framework of which he places this conspiracy. The most clear expression of the meaning of the conspiracy, placed in the mouth of Cato, ch. 52, uses the concepts which receive a detailed treatment in this section and Cato's strictures can be fully evaluated only in the light of the analysis given in these introductory chapters. Consisting as it does of two antithetically opposed segments describing the rise and fall of Roman greatness, this excursus has as its main object the exposition in specific terms of S.'s general doctrine of *virtus-gloria*, the placing of the conspiracy, its *sceleris atque periculi novitas*, in the perspective of Rome's rise in moral greatness and its subsequent decline.

(ii) We should note S.'s tendency to express causal connections from the moral and intellectual standpoint. The basis of this is his belief that all individual acts and thoughts can be traced back to the general and explained as characteristic of mankind. Hence it is his customary mode of thinking to proceed from the general to the particular. Such a way of viewing his material determines the form of the narrative in this excursus. It is a description marked by generalisations and the selection of characteristic features. S. does, as it were, make a concession to history in so far as he deals with actual epochs—the foundation era, the monarchy, the period of the Republic down to the Fall of Carthage and the state of affairs which followed this, from which he takes the beginning of his narrative of the conspiracy. But it is a picture which requires additions and adjustments before it can be accepted as true history. This may be illustrated in two ways. Firstly, in his treatment of the monarchial period there is no mention of the contribution made by the kings to Rome's development. In 7.2 they are associated with a change of government; the reason for the change is explained on the basis of the nature of man—where *licentia* rules, *insolentia* develops. This is the kind of viewpoint which governs the selection and presentation of the material. Secondly, this point of view and the method it involves entails not only the omission of much that would be imperative if the aim were the factual delineation of historical events, but also in some cases distortion of events actually dealt with. Thus the regal period, an age of glory in many ways, is presented in gloomy colours. The customary picture of the Tarquins—*regibus boni quam mali suspectiores sunt* etc. 7.2—is generalised and used as a criterion for the age as a whole. S. transfers to the people (*pericula virtute propulerant*, 6.5)

the characteristics which traditionally were ascribed to the leadership of Romulus and some of his successors. Compare the way that Florus presents the *populus Romanus* as the hero throughout his narrative. On these aspects of S.'s method see further Vretska, *Gymnasium* (1937) 24-43.

(iii) The fact that S. reviews the past history of Rome in all three of his historical works has led most modern commentators to look on those sections as the key to the understanding of his historical viewpoint. Following the impressive work of F. Klingner, *Hermes* 63 (1928) 165-92 there has been a general acceptance of the thesis that a development in S.'s point of view, accompanied by a growing pessimism, can be detected. In essence this thesis states that in the *Bell. Cat.* the crucial year, 146 B.C., is preceded by an age in which mankind is good by its very nature; in the *Bell. Jug.* (ch. 41) the period in which development is possible is viewed as primarily the result of *metus hostilis*. In the *Histories* early history is more gloomily presented as a picture of disunion and internal strife: the cause lies in an innate *vitium humani ingenii quod inquies atque indomitum semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominationis agit* (*Hist.* 1.7M). See, in addition to Klingner, H. Oppermann, *NJ* 11 (1935) 50, *Gymnasium* 65 (1958) 186f.; W. Schur, *Klio* 11 (1936) 60-75; Büchner, 322, 338f.

This commonly held view is contested by O. Seel, *Sallust* etc., Leipzig, 1930, esp. 77ff. and by Vretska, *op. cit.* esp. 38ff. These scholars maintain that what differences exist between these works amount merely to a difference of formulation. Vretska makes the telling point that each formulation is determined by S.'s purpose at the time of composition: in *Bell. Cat.* his purpose is to portray the ethical, in *Bell. Jug.* the political results of the Fall of Carthage. In the *Histories* both types of result are brought together; no new points are made, but a sharper expression is given to the ideas already used in the monographs. The implications of this theory of development in S., particularly its impact on the role of *fortuna* will be discussed in the notes.

(iv) The view that an excursus such as this has a place in the development of ancient historical theory has naturally led to an inquiry into the sources from whence it could have been derived. W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, *Klio* 11 (1936) 60-75, sees a close connection between the ideas expressed here and the historical theory of Polybius, as influenced by Panaetius,

and of Posidonius; it is a theory which ultimately goes back to Plato (*Rep.* 544d-e). W. Theissen, *De Sallustii, Livii, Taciti digressionibus*, Diss. Berlin, 1912, F. Klingner, *op. cit.*, through comparison with Diodorus, 37.3, 38.2 and 34.33 respectively, place S. in dependence on Posidonius, the source of Diodorus. See also Egermann, *SAWW* 214, 3 (1932); F. Schindler, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Sallustbildes*, Diss. Breslau, 1939, 95; K. Bauhofer, *Die Komposition der Historien Sallusts*, Diss. Munchen, 1935, II, V, VI; F. Altheim, *Studi Francisci*, Milan, 1956, 101-114; J. Kroymann, *Festschrift Hommel*, Tübingen, 1961, 69-91. Conflicting views on this aspect, e.g. M. Gelzer, *Ph.* 86 (1931) 261ff.; H. Patzer, *NJAB* 116 (1941) 124-36; W. Avenarius, *SO* 33 (1957) 68f.; A. Klinz, *Der Altspr. Unterricht* 3 (1957) 51-64 serve to underline the difficulty, noted in Appendix II, of arriving at an agreed opinion on Sallustian sources.

Chs. 6-9: *The rise of Rome*

These chapters deal with the foundation epoch, the regal period, the Republic down to the Fall of Carthage. An aspect of their structure deserves attention.

In effect S. says all that he needs to say in ch. 6, which is an expansion of the basic concepts already summarised in 2.1-6. The Roman people owed their greatness to their exercise of *virtus* in war (6.3-5) and solved the difficulty of retaining the *bonae artes* in peace (6.5-6). Yet the concept of the exercise of *virtus* in war receives an expanded treatment, with some significant additions, in ch. 7, and the retention of the *bonae artes* in peace is the principal topic of ch. 9. Broadly, the connection between 2.1-6 and ch. 6 and between ch. 6 and chs. 7 and 9 may be accounted for by S.'s method, referred to earlier, of moving from the general to the particular. In this case also another factor should be added. The emphasis is on citizen-*virtus* from the outset; S. is being quite consistent in placing the emphasis on citizen-*virtus* even in the regal period, with the factor of the wider possibilities for the exercise of *virtus* under the Republican system being duly noted. The apparent lack of appreciation for the achievement of individual kings is no doubt due to his insistence that the constant factor throughout, whether the government be regal or republican, is the *virtus* of the Roman citizen. This has to be emphasised, and hence the detailed treatment in chs. 7 and 9.

6.1. **Urbem Romam... liberum atque solutum:** Livy

makes a similar use of *habere* and *tenere* in the meaning of *incolere* (e.g. 1.57.1) and also employs *profugus* (1.1.4, 1.1.8) and *coalescere* (1.2.5, 1.11.2) in very similar contexts. Cf. also the possible imitation by Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.1 *urbem Romam a principio reges habuere* (Goodyear's note).

sicuti ego accepi: cf. Cato, 62.3J *ego a maioribus memoria sic accepi*; *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.5.1 *sicut a maioribus accepi.*

The phrase clearly implies that there were differences of opinion concerning the way in which Rome was founded, the chief reference being no doubt to the two mutually exclusive legends of Romulus and of Aeneas. S. seems to have accepted the synthesis of the two legends attempted by Cato (*HRR* fr. 4; frr. 8-13) which accounts for the interval of 432 years (fr. 17) between the Fall of Troy and the Foundation of Rome by a framework of circumstantial events drawn from local tradition. This account, which became a standard version and finds typical expression in the numerous versions assembled by Dion. Hal. (Bk. 1), traces a pattern of development from the union between Aborigines and Trojans in which the eventual appearance of Romulus and Remus is satisfactorily accounted for.

The best short account of the foundation legends is that of Ogilvie, 32ff. More detailed works on the subject are J. Perret, *Les Origines de la Legende Troyenne de Rome*, Paris, 1942; F. Bömer, *Rom und Troia*, Baden-Baden, 1955; A. Alföldi, *Die Troianischen Urahnen d. Römer*, Basel, 1957; R. Bloch, *Les origines de Rome*, Paris, 1959, 37ff.; E. Gjerstad, *Legends and Facts of Early Roman History*, Lund, 1960/61, 2. 1962; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, Ann Arbor, 1965. See also A. Momigliano, *JRS* 35 (1945) 99-104; *JRS* 47 (1957) 104-14; *JRS* (1963) 95-121.

et cum his: so Kurfess, following the reading attested by Servius, *ad Aen.* 7.678, and noting that S. never uses *cumque*. The instances of *et cum* which he adduces, however, are not sufficiently numerous to prove that S. consistently preferred this expression; the unanimous reading of the MSS, *cumque* is to be preferred. Servius is not always right; see, e.g. 7.7 *maxumas/ingentes*—Servius, *ad Aen.* 12.230.

Aborigines: cf. Servius' account of Cato's version, *ad Aen.* 1.6 *primo Italiam tenuisse quosdam, qui appellabantur Aborigines. hos postea adventu Aeneae Phrygibus iunctos Latinos uno nomine nuncupatos.* Cf. Dion. Hal., *Arch.* 1.72, who also takes them as

autochtonous. Cato (fr. 6) and Sempronius Tuditanus (*HRR* fr. 1) explain them as Greeks. See *RE* I.10ff.; Ogilvie, 38; the best list of ancient sources is in A. Schwegler, *Rom. Gesch.*, Tübingen, 1867, 1.198, n. 1.

genus hominum agreste . . . liberum atque solutum: cf. Cicero, *Inv.* 1.2; according to Jordan (*Krit. Beitr.* 359) this common version is derived from Dicaearchus whose ideal picture of these people is still extant (Müller, *FHG* 11.225ff.). But it is doubtful if S. intended to convey an ideal picture here. The whole point of his concept of *virtus* is that it should be expressed in the exercise of *bonae artes*. In his summary version of this line of thought (ch. 2) he excludes this stage of primitive simplicity from the arena of worthwhile activity and service, from the exercise of *ingenium* in the pursuit of *gloria* (2.1). Similarly here, life as *genus agreste*—cf. *BJ* 18.2 and the derogatory meaning implied in Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 75—lacks the basic requisite for a life worthy of man, viz. the *civitas* into which this *multitudo divorsa atque vaga* has first to be transformed before the exercise of *bonae artes* can achieve its desired effect. Contrast 6.3 and *BJ* 18.1-2.

sine legibus . . . atque solutum: for this type of listing, characteristic of Sallustian style, see Introd. p. 14.

6.2. **una moenia:** the idea of unification is paramount: *quasi in unum moenibus convenere.*

alius alio more viventes: editors who follow the majority of codices and read *alius alio* probably do so with S.'s practice elsewhere in mind, e.g. 22.2 *alius alii tanti facinoris conscii*, 52.28 *alius alium expectantes cunctamini*. Cf. *BJ* 53.8; Caesar, *BG* 2.26.

It might be noted, in favour of the alternative reading *alii alio*, that while *alius* is suitably applied to individuals inside one group, as in the above examples, one would expect the plural *alii* when, as here, two groups are contrasted; cf. Curtius, 10.5.16. Note however that *Pap. Ox.* VI.884 also has *alius*.

<ita brevi . . . civitas facta erat>: omitted by the major MSS, but preserved in *Pap. Ox.* (with the variant *facta est*) and many *recentiores*, and known to Augustine (*Ep.* 138.10). Rejected as a gloss by earlier editors, e.g. Gerlach, Kritz, Dietsch, it has been included by more recent editors, e.g. Ahlberg, Ernout, Kurfess, with the note "*omittunt codices*".

Jordan, *Hermes* 1 (1866) 246, argues for the retention of the sentence on the grounds that it is essential that we should be told

that a state was formed. This is in keeping also with S.'s insistence throughout on the activity implied by *virtus*, an activity which finds its highest expression in the service of the state. Moreover the sentence is quite in S.'s manner; Jordan well compares 7.3, *BJ* 40.3.

6.3. **postquam . . . videbatur:** "after it began to appear". Cf. 56.4. The use of *postquam* with the imperfect indicative reached its height in Livy.

res eorum . . . aucta: *res* is elsewhere used for *res publica*; cf. *Hist.* 1.11.1M; *res Romana plurimum imperio valuit*; Livy, 1.3.1, 1.9.9, 21.2.5 *et al.* It is also used by Ennius, *Ann.* 466, 500V, and often by Cato, e.g. 8.6J *res eorum auxit.*

sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur: could be interpreted as *habent se = sunt*, on the analogy of the Greek idiom ὡς ἔχει τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν θνητῶν. It could suggest, however, that mankind is at the mercy of superior powers; cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 22 *enimvero di nos quasi pilas homines habent.*

invidia ex opulentia: for the idea of riches and power as the basis of envy cf. Thucydides, 1.2.4; Plato, *Menex.* 242a. Elsewhere S. uses *divitiae* to denote the effect of riches after the early *concordia* was destroyed. *Opulentia*, which embraces both *divitiae* and *opes*, does not appear in Cicero and Caesar. It does occur in Plautus, *Bacch.* 519, *Trin.* 490; Virgil, *Aen.* 7.262; Gellius, 20.5.8; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.55.3.

6.4. **reges populique:** i.e. the legendary Lars Porsena, the federal leagues of the Latini, the Aequian and Volscian tribes; cf. *CAH* VII. ch. XIff. An example of S.'s generalising method—the details do not matter nor do the omissions. The emphasis is on *virtus*, both that which grew out of the creation of *res publica* and that necessary in time of war; the latter receives expanded treatment in ch. 7.

pauci ex amicis: e.g. the Albani in the war against the Fidenates and Veii. Cf. Livy, Bk. 1; Dion. Hal. Bk. 1.

nam ceteri . . . aberant: see on 56.4 n. *sperabat.*

metu perculsi: cf. *BJ* 40.4, 58.2. S.'s preference for *percellere* (15 times) as opposed to *perterrere* (once, 28.1) is in marked contrast to Cicero's practice; *percellere* occurs only once in the speeches—*pro Scaur.* 34. Skard, *Ennius u. Sallust.*, 46, points to the use of *percellere* in Ennius (*Sc.* 38V) and assumes Ennius to be S.'s model here.

6.5. **at Romani . . . armis tegere:** the flurry of activity rendered by a succession of historic infinitives (Introd. p. 19) represents the exercise of *virtus* in time of war and involves both physical and intellectual powers.

The emphasis is on the Roman people. No mention is made of the kings who led them. The "hero" of S.'s archaeology is *populus Romanus*; it is the *concordia* and *virtus* of the *populus* which have created the state, maintained it against foreign tribes. The anonymity of description is at the expense of the kings. It shows itself, for example, in the impersonal *postquam res eorum civibus moribus agris aucta*, where no mention is made of the successive contributions of Romulus (*civibus*), Numa (*moribus*), Tullus Hostilius (*agris*). The mention of kingly rule in Rome occurs only by the way in 6.6, and in 6.7 the reference to *conservandae libertatis atque augendae rei publicae* is again in very general terms. This lack of precision may be due to his preoccupation with basic moral concepts; to the emphasis on *concordia* as the primary state-building *virtus*. The public spirit which a healthy citizen-life generated is viewed as republican throughout. Cf. Cicero, *de Rep.* 1.39.

patriam parentisque: "country and parents" as in 52.3, *BJ* 87.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.59.6. *Parentes* from *parēre* = "subjects" is also found combined with *patria*, e.g. *BJ* 3.2.

ubi . . . propulerant: in 6.7 *ubi* is used with the perfect *convortit*. The pluperfect here indicates an action completed before the continuous action indicated by the imperfects begins.

auxilia portabant: the use of *portabant* for *ferebant* is unusual, although it occurs in Terence, *Andr.* 338, *Hecyr.* 513 where perhaps the strictly classical usage of *portare* ("*de rebus gravioris ponderis*") is extended to a figurative usage for important things. Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 869, *Stich.* 276; Livy, 45.1.10; Ovid, *Pont.* 3.4.1. Later, *portare* supplanted *ferre* altogether and we find e.g. *beneficia portare, auspicia portare*, etc.

magisque dandis . . . amicitias parabant: cf. Thucydides, 2.40.4.

6.6. **imperium legitumum . . . appellabantur:** the casual mention that the Roman *imperium* was once regal is offset by the emphasis on the people, this time the *delecti* who form the Senate. The unusually detailed description of the competence of the Senate in this regal context may again be due primarily to S.'s contention that citizen-*virtus* is the key to greatness.

ingenium sapientia validum: the conjunction of talent with wisdom seems to be imperative for S.'s concept of *virtus*. Thus he grants Catiline *ingenium* but denies him *sapientia* (5.5). Elsewhere this element of *sapientia* is expressed as *bene consulere* (e.g. 37.8, 51.4-5, 51.7, 52.21, 52.29) and is conceived of from the beginning as an indispensable ingredient (1.6). This element of *sapientia/consilium* was also a stock ingredient of the political theorising of S.'s age; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 7.21.1 *non animus, non consilium . . . non diligentia*; *ibid.* 8.3.3; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.2.2 *cum homine . . . maiore fortuna quam sapientia.*

rei publicae consultabant: the frequentative verb (Introd. p. 18f.) is given the same meaning and construction as the simple *consulere*; cf. *Hist.* 2.47.13M. Elsewhere, e.g. 51.1, S. uses the normal *de* with abl. after *consultare*, meaning *deliberare*. The construction and meaning given to the verb here is found elsewhere only in Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 15.6 *reipublicae consultavit.* Cf. Julius Valerius, 2.27, 3.8 (*Thes. LL.* 4.594).

hi vel aetate vel . . . patres appellabantur: for a variety of conjectures on the origin of the titles, *senatus* and *patres*, cf. Cicero, *de Rep.* 2.14 *qui appellati sunt propter caritatem patres*; Livy, 1.8.7 *patres certe ab honore, patriciique progenies eorum appellati.* Florus, 1.1.15 rationalises: *consilium rei p. penes senes esset, qui ex auctoritate patres, ob aetatem senatus vocabantur.* Cf. also Ovid, *Fasti* 5.64ff.; Quintilian, 1.6.33; Festus, 454L; Eutropius, 1.2; Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.426, 5.758, 8.105; Isidorus, *Orig.* 9.4.8-10. See further P. Willems, *Le sénat* etc., Louvain, 1873, 1, 9; Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 3.835ff.; *RE* Suppl. VI '*Senatus*'.

6.7. **post ubi regium . . . animum humanum:** the situation remarked upon in general in 2.5 *verum ubi pro labore . . . inmutatur* is here applied specifically to the kings, and it leads to a change of government. Here we have a specific application of the dictum in 2.6 *ita imperium . . . transfertur.*

conservandae libertatis: some codices have the scribal emendation *libertatis causa* which would make this a normal classical construction. But a genitive of cause or purpose is first met with in *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.26 without a preposition: *patris ulciscendi* and in 2.48 *rei leniendae* etc. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.3, 1.77.11M; Livy, 3.24.1, 5.3.5, 5.6.15; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.59.1. See L-H-S 75 with lit. cited.

in superbiam: in 2.5 *superbia* is connected with *lubido*, a

train of thought suggested perhaps by the annalistic tradition, present also in Livy, concerning the overthrow of the tyrant-kings, where the sole ruler is overthrown when an act of *libido* is added to his arrogance. Cf. Florus, 1.1.7 *tam diu superbiam regis populus Romanus perpessus est donec aberat lubido.* This conjunction of vices was also a feature of Greek political propaganda (F. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, London, 1907, 132). For another link with the annalistic tradition cf. Dion. Hal. *Arch.* 4.73.4 on the dual magistracy.

dominationemque: the Romans tended to attach the meaning "tyrant" to *dominus* and on this account Augustus refused it as a title, Cassius Dio, 55.12.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 53.1; Orosius, 6.22; Isidorus, *Orig.* 9.3.17.

se convortit: *se* is omitted by some inferior codices. At 52.27, *BJ* 20.4, 85.9, 101.6 the reflexive pronoun is not used. But even without the pronoun the verb often retains its reflexive or passive force.

annua imperia: Cicero, *Leg.* 3.8 invents an old law defining duality of power (*regio imperio duo sunto, iique praeeundo, iudicando, consulendo praetores, iudices consules appellamino*) from which it appears that these chief magistrates were early called *praetores* and *iudices*, referring to their military and civil powers respectively. According to the tradition these titles were older than *consul*, which the ancients derive from *consulere.*

eo modo . . . animum humanum: on S.'s use of hyperbaton see Introd. p. 15.

per licentiam insolescere animum humanum: a further illustration of S.'s historical viewpoint. The momentous changeover to the consulship is explained simply on the basis of the nature of man; no regard is paid to other significant factors—political, social, economic. For the significance of this statement for S.'s general views on the forces which shape history see on 9.1 n. *ius bonumque.*

Per licentiam is in contrast to the idea embodied in the preceding *libertas* and *adepta libertate* of 7.3. *Licentia* carries with it the idea of *lubido* (cf. Cicero, *2Verr.* 1.33), of unrestrained use of power (Livy, 3.37.8). The *lubido-superbia* combination of 2.5 is here repeated with the use of *insolescere* (*insolentia*); cf. *Thes. LL.* 7.1931.34ff. On the use of the instrumental and modal *per* see Introd. p. 19f.

7.1-2. **sed ea tempestate . . . formidulosa est:** S.'s attitude to the kingship as expressed in *nam regibus* etc. is partly due to his method of composition (see p. 67), but it is also in keeping with the attitude to kingship and tyranny which is part of the historical and annalistic tradition. S.'s expression has its origin in Greek thought: Herodotus, 5.92.3; Euripides, *Suppl.* 444ff. Cf. Livy, 35.43.1 *virtutem et bonum alienum oderunt*; Tacitus, *Agric.* 41 *infensus virtutibus princeps.*

ea tempestate: Cicero's remark (*de Orat.* 3.153) *neque enim illud fugerim dicere ut Coelius 'qua tempestate Poenus in Italiam venit'* gives the impression that by S.'s time *tempestas* in the meaning of *tempus* was considered an archaism. It is not uncommon in old Latin, but *tempestas* usually, as in Plautus, has the meaning of "storm". Much in the same way as *facinus, tempestas* gradually took on the meaning of time in a bad sense, a meaning which had originally required an adjective; e.g. Cato, *RR* 2.2J *tempestates malas*; cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 457, 527V *tempestas serena.* S.'s use of *tempestas* for *tempus* should, in conjunction with its similar usage by Catullus, Livy and Gellius, be taken as a deliberate archaism, especially characteristic of historiography. See H. Heusch, *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls*, Bonn, 1954, 51ff.

coepere se quisque: *quisque* often takes the place of a plural subject. Cf. e.g. *BJ* 1.4; Plautus, *Capt.* 500; *Curc.* 180; Livy, 7.19.2, 25.12.2; Tacitus, *Agric.* 3; Curtius, 4.4.14.

boni quam mali: both words get their meaning from S.'s concept of *virtus*; *boni*, therefore, here means "talented". S. tends to put contrasted words immediately on either side of *quam*, e.g. 1.3, 54.6, *BJ* 31.28, 50.6.

formidulosa: always in S. (e.g. 7.5, 19.2, 52.13) has the meaning "terrible", as in Cicero, *pro Cluent.* 7, *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 62. The word sometimes has a passive meaning "terrified", as in Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.62.2; Terence, *Eun.* 756. See Gellius, 9.12.1; Nonius, 162L; Donatus, *Ter. Eun.* 756; Servius, *ad Aen.* 4.72; *Thes. LL.* 6.1100. 55ff.

7.3. **adepta libertate:** *adeptus* is again used passively at *BJ* 101.9. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.7.5; Suetonius, *Tib.* 38, and for an earlier example Plautus, *Trin.* 367 (with the variant, *apiscitur*). Other deponents used passively by S. are *enisus* (*BJ* 25.2), *interpretatus* (*BJ* 17.7), *ludificatus* (*BJ* 50.4), *machinatus* (*BC* 48.7). This passive use of *deponents* is dealt with by Priscian, 2.379.12ff.K,

and by Gellius, 15.13. See L-H-S, 287ff.; Wackernagel, 1.124ff. The apparent contradiction with 6.7 (*conservandae libertatis*) can be resolved if we interpret *libertas* of 6.7 as the freedom of the state vis-à-vis other states; *libertas* of this passage refers to the freedom of the Roman people.

quantum brevi creverit: for a similar remark concerning Athens cf. Herodotus, 5.66.1. Another Sallustian generalisation. According to Livy's version the history of Rome after the expulsion of the Tarquins was for some time a story of decline rather than of progress.

tanta cupido gloriae incesserat: this simple form of parataxis, the substitution of an explanatory principal clause for a subordinate causal clause (Introd. p. 14f.) seems to have found a firm place in historical writing. Compare this passage and *BJ* 84.3 with Livy, 10.25.1 *tanta cupido* etc.; 36.5 *tanta vis* and *BJ* 32.4 with Livy, 3.47.4. Cf. also Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.27.3, *Ann.* 2.72.2. It is also found in Plautus, e.g. *Cas.* 625, *Epid.* 83, *Rud.* 668, and in epic, e.g. Virgil, *Aen.* 1.33. On the absolute use of *incedere* see on 10.6 *invasit.*

7.4. **iam primum iuventus:** the importance of the *iuventus* for S.'s theme is shown by his repeated reference to them; cf. 12.2, 13.4, 14.5, 16.1.

iuventus, simul ac . . . erat . . . discebat . . . habebant: on this type of *constructio ad sensum*, variation in the number of the verb with a collective noun, see Introd. p. 16. In the case of *habebant* here, however, it may be conceded that *scorta* and *convivia*, implying a somewhat more individualistic activity, are less suited to a generalised *iuventus*.

simul ac: used only here in S. The more usual *ubi primum* most probably was avoided because of *primum* immediately preceding.

per laborem usum militiae: a reading attested in only one MS (T) and in codd. Q π of Vegetius, *epit. rei mil.* Alternative readings of Sallustian MSS and of Vegetius are *usu militiae, usu militia, usum militiam, usu militiam.* It might be contended that the juxtaposition *per laborem usu* is not very attractive and that *labore et usu militiam* would be more satisfactory, but the use of *per* is a Sallustian feature and there is no compelling reason for supposing that S. could not have written *per laborem usu militiam discebat.*

lubidinem: has been taken on the strength of this passage as

being capable of being used of morally correct desires (Nonius, 727L). That the word can have that meaning needs no demonstration. But surely *lubido*, next to *scorta* here, has its normal meaning and the double meaning (*delectationem habere*) is exploited deliberately. For a close parallel to this passage see Isocrates, *Areop.* 48.

7.5. **igitur talibus viris ... virtus omnia domuerat:** the manner of living pictured here and in the following passage, in which the driving force is *cupido gloriae*, represents the kind of ideal picture which Romans retained of their past and which is reflected many times in their literature. S.'s view is echoed by Cicero, *pro Arch.* 26, *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 7, with the difference, however, that Cicero restricts *cupido gloriae* to the ruling class. On the Roman views on *gloria* compare U. Knoche, *Ph.* 89 (1934) 102ff. and G. B. Philipp, *Gymnasium* 62 (1955) 51-82, 287-8, and see p. 33.

asper aut arduus: a doublet which probably goes back to Cato (e.g. 38.9J).

virtus omnia domuerat: another form of parataxis where an explanatory clause is supplied by means of an exclamatory conclusion (epiphonema). See Introd. p. 15.

domuerat: seems to be used in its poetic sense of to level the rough, soften the hard. Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 9.608; Sil. Ital. 3.499. But see *Thes. LL.* 5.1942ff., esp. 1946.45.

7.6. **sed gloriae maxumum ... volebant:** the number of close parallels, both in thought and expression, in Greek writings, especially in praise of Athens, and the use of similar ideas by other writers on Rome suggest that S. is here drawing upon a store of traditional material connected with *laudes Romae*. He has, as usual, adapted his models to his own purposes.

sed gloriae ... tale facinus faceret: bears a very close resemblance to Isocrates, *Paneg.* 79. A comparison of the style of the passages, however, where the balance and careful chiastic arrangements of participles and verbs of Isocrates contrast with the rough rapidity of S.'s succession of infinitives, underlines once more S.'s deliberate avoidance of the symmetry of the rhetorical style so admired by Cicero (*Orat.* 37-42, 167, 172-5, *Brut.* 32-3, *de Orat.* 3.173). *Sed* here introduces the notion of the pursuit of *gloria* for individual purposes as contrasted with the pursuit of *gloria* for state purposes.

se quisque hostem ferire . . . properabat: on the use of accus. and infin. instead of simple infin. see 1.1. It is a usage rare in classical Latin but common in early Latin, particularly with *velle* (Bennett, 1.381). *Properare* here clearly follows the analogy of *cupere.*

hostem ferire: occurs again at 60.4, *BJ* 85.33. An archaic expression used, apart fom S., by Ennius, *Ann.* 280V and Livy, 22.38.4.

murum ascendere: may refer to one of the ancient military prizes, the *corona muralis.* See Gellius, 5.6.

conspici: cf. Cicero's definition of *gloria, Inv.* 2.166 *gloria est frequens de aliquo fama cum laude.* U. Knoche, *Ph.* 89 (1934) 106, interprets the ancient Roman *fama* as primarily dependent on the judgement of others, an interpretation rejected by G. B. Philipp, *Gymnasium* 62 (1955) 54f., who maintains that the criterion of *gloria* is the concrete accomplishment representing, in its highest form, service to *res publica.* S. is here emphasising the idea of recognition by others.

facinus facere: see Introd. p. 18 on *figura etymologica.* Cicero uses this phrase in *Fin.* 2.95 and Madvig notes on this '*familiaris sermonis imitatio aliqua*'. It is probable that instances of the figure in Cicero—*servitutem servire, dicta dicere, gaudium gaudere*— are reminiscences from Plautus and Terence. Livy uses *facinus facere* (1.33.8) and others besides, e.g. *acta agere, donis donare.* See Kroll on Catullus, 81.6; H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache,* Berlin, 1934, ch. 1.

eas divitias . . . volebant: cf., in addition to Isocrates, *Areop.* 48, Demosthenes, *Androt.* 76, *Timoc.* 183-4 for the same idea.

eas divitias, eam bonam famam: *eas, eam* for *id,* following a general rule that a pronominal subject adapts itself in number and gender to the predicative noun. Cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 697; Livy, 2.38.5; Virgil, *Aen.* 6.129.

pecuniae liberales: see 5.4 n. *sui profusus.*

divitias honestas: in S.'s sense equivalent to *divitias bonis artibus partas.* Cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.10.5 *qui per virtutem divitias . . . pepererunt*; *ibid.* 2.13.2. For the opposite see *BJ* 8.1 *quibus divitiae bono honestoque potiores erant.* The contrast with the present time (i.e. *nunc divitias ingentes*) is implicit in the phrase *gloriam ingentem.*

7.7. **memorare possum:** *possum* is supported by Servius,

ad Aen. 12.230, but the majority of codices have *possem*. Latin, however, generally has expressions of possibility and necessity in the indicative.

maxumas hostium copias . . . fuderit: a phrase which was probably part of traditional annalistic material. Cf. Livy's use of the same expression with regard to Alexander the Great, 35. 14.7.

pugnando: used in a modal rather than in an instrumental sense; cf. 61.2, *BJ* 28.7, 51.5. The Columna Rostrata (*CIL* I^2.25) has *Macellam pugnandod cepet*. Cf. also Livy, 3.53.9 (*qui*) *vivit nec inferendo iniuriam nec patiendo*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.38.3.

Chapter 8: The connection of this chapter with what precedes and what follows is not immediately apparent. It serves, however, to supply a deficiency noted in S.'s statement on historiography in 4.1-2, viz. the service which the writing of history performs. True *fama* attends *facinora* when these deeds are worthily recorded. The *laudes Romae* of ch. 9 give evidence of a close imitation of the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, and this makes feasible the suggestion of Perrochat (68) that S. saw himself performing for Rome what Isocrates, especially in *Paneg.* 75-81, had done for Athens; cf. Dion. Hal. *Isocr.* 5. However, as usual, S. writes in his own Roman way and the influence of Cato should not be discounted. The observation that the deeds of the Greeks had won much greater fame than those of the Romans because the Greeks had historians and eulogists whereas the Romans were men of affairs has its prototype in Cato (19-20J). It is an idea often referred to in Roman literature, e.g. Horace, *Od.* 4.8.20f.; 4.9.25ff.; Cicero, *pro Arch.* 24.

8.1. **sed profecto fortuna . . . obscuratque:** cf. Demosthenes, *de Cor.* 194. The idea of *fortuna* portrayed here should be taken as a Greek concept in a Greek context; *fortuna* is represented as the arbitrary power which lies beyond the control of man. This is by no means S.'s own attitude to *fortuna*. For his treatment of the concept and the apparent contradictions in his treatment see on 10.1.

ea: for the parataxis see Introd. p. 14f. The repetition of the subject by means of *is*, *ea*, *id*, classified by J. B. Hofmann, *Lat. Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg, 1926, 104 as a colloquial expression, is very much a feature of early Latin prose; see an excellent example

in Quadrigarius (*HRR* fr. 10b) *is* . . . *id* . . . *is* . . . *ea*. Its occurrence in Cato (e.g. 62.6J, *RR* 6.1. *et al.*) probably accounts for its appeal to S.

obscuratque: for the alternative force of *-que* here cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.11.1 *bonum malumque* . . . *aestumant*; Livy, 23.1.9; Horace, *Sat.* 2.3.157; Virgil, *Aen.* 2.37. See Löfstedt, *Philol. Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 1911, 200f. on Lucretius, 5.984, 1237; 6.114 (*-que* = *vel*); Lucretius, 3.551, 5.965 (*atque* = *vel*); Bailey on Lucr. 2.825 (*-que* = *sive*).

8.2. **aestumo:** the more weighty and more suitable word, preferable to the trite *existimo* of some codices. Moreover, if it is a question of textual corruption, *existimo* is more likely to have arisen from *aestumo* (*estimo*) than the other way round.

aliquanto minores: i.e. *aliqua ex parte minores*, "a good deal".

8.3. **provenere:** "crop up"; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.26.2 (*dominationes*); Pliny, Ep. 1.13.1 *magnum proventum poetarum annus hic attulit.*

scriptorum magna ingenia: no doubt referring to the historians Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and eulogists like Demosthenes and Isocrates.

8.4. **ita eorum qui fecere:** so P and some *recentiores*, supported by Jerome (*Vita Hilar. prol.*) and Augustine; accepted by most editors after Cortius on the grounds that we are dealing with a general statement, much as in 3.1. Kritz insisted on *qui ea fecere*, the reading of the majority of the codices, on the grounds of specific reference to the Athenians and that a general statement should be followed by *verbis possunt extollere*. The matter is nicely balanced. It can be contended that there is no good reason why *potuere* should not convey a general maxim; that the general reflection is interposed and that *at* of the following sentence refers back across it to *Athenienses*, an untidy way of writing but one not out of keeping with S.'s style. However, *at populo Romano* tilts the balance in Kritz's favour; *populus Romanus* is better contrasted with *Athenienses* than with people in general, for no doubt others, as well as the Romans, failed to get the celebration they deserved.

8.5. **copia:** probably not "supply" of writers, but the "opportunity" of having their deeds recorded by such writers. Such a meaning is suggested by the sequence of thought: *provenere* . . . *magna ingenia* . . . *potuere* . . . *praeclara ingenia* . . . *at populo Roma-*

no nunquam ea copia fuit. For the force of *copia* here cf. 17.6. See also Plautus, *Capt.* 218, *Miles,* 1226. For the sentiment cf. Ovid, *Fasti,* 3.101ff. When Cicero says, *Leg.* 1.5 *abest historia litteris nostris* it is not a matter of lack of talent, but of opportunity amid so many affairs.

negotiosus: the basic meaning: *rebus strenue gerendis intentus.* In this context one could interpret further as: *in republica administranda occupatus,* as is implied in *BJ* 4.4, and as *negotiis militaribus intentus* as implied in Cicero, *pro Mur.* 22.

ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat: note the hyperbaton (Introd. p. 15). The emphasis is on activity, tangible service to the state in war and politics; see on 3.1. The Romans have advanced beyond the stage of earlier kingdoms (2.1) and both *ingenium* and *vis corporis* are used in state service.

optumus quisque facere ... narrare malebat: emphasis on the practical basis of old Roman *virtus.* S. neglects the opportunity to defend his adoption of historiography by calling upon the precedent of Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, and Cato among others.

9.1. **igitur domi militiaeque boni mores colebantur:** in this chapter, which summarises views on Roman progress before the onset of degeneration, the emphasis is on *mores* both in war and peace. This concentration on the moral aspect gives rise to a generalised and idealised picture, deliberately contrived to heighten the contrast with the picture of deterioration which follows in chs. 10-13.

In presenting his summary, S. draws upon a store of traditional concepts, and his method, as noted elsewhere, involves the omission of many historical events which would not easily fit in with his generalised schema. While, as we shall see in ch. 10, he takes a specific event (Fall of Carthage) as marking the changeover from progress to deterioration, his picture of a period when *boni mores colebantur* is on broad lines a true one when contrasted with the period when this state of affairs no longer prevailed.

igitur: another example of anaphoric *igitur,* in this case marking the return to the end of ch. 7. Cf. *igitur,* 2.1.

concordia maxuma, minuma avaritia erat: *concordia* is the leading concept chosen by S. to characterise the period of greatness, just as *avaritia* becomes the leading concept of his picture of the decline in chs. 10-13. The combination *concordia-virtus* (ὁμόνοια-

ἀνδρεία cf. Dion. Hal. 2.3.4) and the antithesis *concordia-avaritia* (ὁμόνοια-πλεονεξία) derives from the descriptions of the ideal state of Lycurgus (M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* 59 (1924) 159) and are prominent in the exhortations of Isocrates to king Philip. See also on 6.5.

ius bonumque . . . non legibus magis quam natura valebat: a formula which has been used elsewhere to describe the purity of primitive peoples, e.g. Virgil, *Aen.* 7.202ff.; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.26, *Germ.* 19, 2 *plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges.*

The statement in Seneca, *Ep.* 90.4-6, that men in earliest times followed the dictates of nature, had no propensity to injustice, that it was not until deterioration set in that the need for laws arose, has given rise to a similar interpretation of S.'s *ius bonumque* etc., and led to the theory that there is a progressive pessimism in S.'s views on the nature of man. This interpretation of S.'s statement implies that laws were not needed in early Rome since strong *concordia* repressed self-seeking (*avaritia*). It is conceded that such a representation of early times cannot be explained in terms of actual Roman history and it is generally felt that it is an overstatement inherited from Greek thinking, perhaps occasioned by S.'s striving after the sharpest contrast possible with what results from a decline in moral standards.

However, S.'s words: *non legibus magis quam natura* need not necessarily be interpreted as depicting a state of pristine innocence. Nowhere in S. does there occur such a statement as we find in Seneca, *Ep.* 90.4 *primi mortalium quique ex his geniti naturam incorrupti sequebantur.* The sentiment S. uses here applies to primitives, not to people living in a community such as Rome. Where a *civitas* is concerned it has been his constant theme that man can develop his *ingenium* either *bonis artibus* or *malis artibus.* It is firstly, then, a matter of choosing the right moral goals. See on 2.5.

Secondly, S. has emphasised that the ideal arena for the exercise of *virtus* is within the properly organised *res publica* (6.2-7). While concentrating on moral concepts, he has occasionally indicated that this condition of an ideal moral viewpoint is dependent upon proper control. *Minuma avaritia* is not a complete negation of *avaritia*; *insolentia* as a character trait emerges even in this best period, and *lubido* and *licentia* of man must be regulated (6.7, 51.4; cf. *BJ* 6.3, *Hist.* 1.7M). Similarly, removal of a major

regulating factor, fear of outside enemies, shows its most disastrous results in the moral degeneration of the people. Moreover, the very ideas of *concordia* and *libertas* imply control, acceptance of the rule of law, acceptance of a constitution based upon Senate and people, upon officials and *imperium*.

Finally, S.'s consideration of the ideas of *ius* and *bonum*—variously expressed as *aequum, rectum, decorum, utile* etc.—are always within the context of either *e re publica* or *contra rem publicam* (2.5, 31.6, 38.3), and in 9.3-5 the insistence is upon the *artes* which are deliberately exercised both in war and peace, and which by their very nature demand control and regulation.

non legibus magis quam natura: the meaning wrested from this phrase has undoubtedly coloured the various interpretations of S.'s meaning. It has been taken as a form of connection whereby the first member of the comparison is of less weight than the second. Alternatively it has been argued that both members of the comparison have equal weight. The most that can be said of it is that S. does not rule out either means of achieving *concordia*.

9.2. **iurgia discordias . . . fideles erant:** a compressed elucidation of *concordia maxuma*. The emphasis on the moral aspect has led to a picture of the Roman past which is idealised and defective. It omits such well-attested features as troubles with armies, the growth of wealth and luxury, demoralisation and unrest at home. For full documentation of these features see Earl, 41, nn. 3-5. It is noteworthy that in the *Histories*, where a different viewpoint controls the presentation of material, S. modifies this unhistorical picture. Before the Fall of Carthage—a turning point common to all three of his works—he mentions a period of *discordia* with the expulsion of the kings, a further period of unrest representing the struggle of the orders, and, finally, between the second and third Punic wars a period of *optumi mores* and *maxuma concordia* because of *metus Punicus* (*Hist.* 1.11, 12, 16M).

iurgia discordias . . . de virtute certabant: another widely canvassed concept. Cf. Isocrates, *Paneg.* 85; Polybius, 6.46.7. Apparently S.'s liking for asyndetic lists (Introd. p. 14) sometimes triumphs over brevity: one word would have sufficed for *iurgia discordias simultates*.

in suppliciis deorum . . . fideles erant: see a close parallel in Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.25-6; cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1123a. This Greek concept was also transferred to a Roman setting by other

writers—cf. Horace, *Od.* 2.15.13ff.; Cicero, *pro Flacc.* 28. Livy's use of it at 6.41.8 suggests that it was a *topos* of *laus maiorum.*

suppliciis: equivalent to *supplicationibus. Supplicium* used in this sense is archaic, used only in poetry, e.g. Afranius (171R), Accius (298R). It occurs in Varro, *RR* 2.5.10; Livy, 22.57.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.64.3. Cicero and Caesar use *supplicium* only for "punishment". Festus (404L) on *supplex/supplicium* indicates that it signifies both punishment and supplication or sacrifice from its original meaning of "kneeling down". See R. Heinze, "Supplicium", *Archiv f. lat. Lex.* 15 (1908) 89ff.

9.3. **ubi pax evenerat:** a turn of phrase which enables S. to avoid the usual *in bello-in pace* which in any case he uses below. Wirz sees in this an emphasis that justice was practised "even against their former foes". What follows shows clearly that no more than *in pace* is meant.

seque remque publicam: on the use of *-que -que* see Introd. p. 19. Cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 18, 184, 239V; often in Plautus. The correspondingly archaic *-que et* which appears as an archaism in Catullus (H. Heusch, *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls,* Bonn, 1954, 158f.) and which Livy, Curtius and Tacitus imitated from S. appears only in the *Bell. Jug. -que -que* is never used by Caesar; Cicero uses it a few times, but nearly always when quoting or translating words of other writers, e.g. *Tusc. Disp.* 1.115, *de Nat. Deor.* 2.4, *Fin.* 1.51. Livy joins two relative clauses in this way, e.g. 1.55.6 (cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.16.1) and Tacitus uses it at *Ann.* 2.3.2 in S.'s manner. See further L-H-S, 515; Löfstedt, *Synt.* 2.306; Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus,* 209ff.; J. Richmond, *Ph.* 112 (1968) 130.

curabant: the Catonic combination *rem publicam curare* (33.2J) occurs also at *Hist.* 1.77.20M. It is taken up by Tacitus (e.g. *Hist.* 1.26.1, 1.88.3 *cura reipublicae*) and by Ammianus (16.5.5 *et saepe*).

9.4. **in eos qui contra imperium:** a most notable example, that of T. Manlius Torquatus, is referred to in detail in 52.30. For the example of Postumius Tubertus see Val. Max. 2.7.6; Livy, 4.29.5. On both stories see Ogilvie, 576ff. S.'s attitude to this aspect of the *mos maiorum* may be inferred from his report of the action of the Senator, Fulvius, in 39.5, and his repeating of the Manlius story at 52.30. See nn. *ad loc.* On the penalties for unmilitary conduct cf. Polybius, 6.37ff.; Dion. Hal. 9.27ff.; Livy, Bk. 2.

9.5. **in pace vero . . . persequi malebant:** just as in time of war *virtus* expresses itself in *audacia* and endurance, so in peace it is marked by the *artes—iustitia, aequitas, continentia.*

beneficiis magis quam metu: cf. Isocrates, *Paneg.* 80 and Thucydides, 6.92.5 ἑκούσῃς καὶ οὐ βίᾳ. Similar statements concerning Rome were made before S. by Cicero (*Off.* 2.27) and by Panaetius (cf. H. Dahlmann, *NJW* 10 (1934) 19f.). *Magis* is omitted by P, D[1], l, s[1]. If it is not a genuine reading then *quam* has to be taken as equivalent to *potius quam* or *agitare* has to be read for *agitabant.*

ignoscere quam persequi: *ignoscere* can stand absolutely; cf. *Hist.* 1.77.6M *ignoscundo populi Romani magnitudinem auxisse. Persequi* requires an object and *eam* should be supplied from *accepta iniuria.* Cf. *BJ* 14.23 *tuasne iniurias persequar*; Cicero, *pro Mur.* 44 *acceptam iniuriam persequi non placet?*

Chapters 10-13. *The decline of Rome*

The structure of chs. 10-13 is akin to that of chs. 6-9 in so far as S. really says in ch. 10 all he needs to say about the degeneration of Rome. In other words, just as ch. 6 of itself adequately expands the first part of the summary in 5.9 *quo modo . . . reliquerint,* so ch. 10 is of itself a sufficient expansion of the second part of the summary: *ut paulatim . . . facta sit.* Chapter 6 was, however, expanded into greater detail in chs. 7 & 9, both because of S.'s characteristic method of composition and because of his desire to emphasise and clarify aspects and concepts important to his purpose. In like manner the content of ch. 10 receives a second treatment in detail in chs. 11-13. One other point of similarity may be noted. Just as ch. 8 is in a way a digression within the schema of chs. 6-9, so ch. 13 adds nothing essentially new to what is said in chs. 11-12. It does, however, allow S. to re-emphasise the connection between *luxuria* and the *iuventus* who figure prominently in his description of the following of Catiline (chs. 14-16) with which he begins his treatment of the conspiracy proper.

10.1 **sed ubi . . . r. publica . . . crevit . . . reges domiti . . . nationes . . . subacti . . . Carthago . . . interiit . . . cuncta . . . patebant:** this swing between the active and the passive is characteristic of S.'s striving after *variatio.* See Introd. p. 19.

labore atque iustitia: *labor* especially in war, *iustitia* in peace, summarising the basic thought of 6.5 and 9.3.

reges magni: e.g. Philip V and Perses, kings of Macedon, Antiochus III (The Great) of Asia, Jugurtha of Numidia, Mithridates of Pontus.

reges . . . nationes . . . populi: embraces the whole world of Roman domination, cf. *Hist.* 4.69.5M. Thus Cicero, *Off.* 2.26 says: *regum, populorum, nationum portus erat et refugium senatus.* This, therefore, is not a case of S.'s favourite synonym combinations; each word has its specific meaning although they may be combined without precise distinction of signification. Strictly used, *natio* refers to common origin, *populus* to a community of institutions. *Nationes* with its adjective *ferae* would refer to more remote and less settled peoples (tribes) than the Carthaginians to whom the term *populus* would more correctly refer. The combination *nationes populi,* which is repeated at 20.7, occurs also in Cato (23.6J).

Carthago aemula imperi Romani: a phrase copied by Vell. Pat. 1.12.6; Lactantius, *Inst.* 7.15.15; Pomponius Mela, 1.34; Claudius Mamertinus, *Paneg. Max. Aug.* 8.1.

In choosing 146 B.C. as his turning point S. rejects a well-established tradition that by the middle of the 2nd cent. the processes which eventually destroyed the Republic were already at work. The annalistic tradition, represented by Livy, 39.6.7, ascribes the crisis to the return of Manlius Vulso's army from Asia in 187 B.C. Polybius, conscious of a change in moral standards from 200 B.C. onwards, places the crisis in the years in which Rome had achieved world dominion, viz. after 168 B.C. (31.25.3ff.; cf. Diodorus, 31.26. See also C. O. Brink and F. W. Walbank, *CQ* 48 (1954) 103ff.). The annalist L. Piso dated the onset of degeneration at 154 B.C. (Pliny, *NH* 17.244 = Piso, fr. 38 *HRR*). None of these accounts, as Earl (44) remarks, precludes the possibility of the truth of the others. The various disturbing signs can present a picture of developing moral decline.

S.'s avoidance of this annalistic tradition is not the result of ignorance. Part of the evidence on which the tradition is based derives from Cato. S.'s awareness of the tradition is also shown by the parallels of concept and phraseology discernible in his account and that of Livy. The reason for his rejection seems to lie in his concentration on an aspect of the period different from that which appears in Cato, Polybius, Piso and Livy. His emphasis is on *concordia,* the result of *virtus,* which made Rome great on the principle enunciated in *BJ* 10.6 *concordia parvae res crescunt,*

discordia maxumae dilabuntur. By concentrating on this factor and ignoring concomitant aspects of a most complex situation, such as factions among the nobility, increase in public and private wealth etc., S. produces a generalised and idealistic account. See R. M. Henry, *Proc. Class. Assoc.* 34 (1937) 7f.; F. Hampl, *Hist. Zeitschr.* 184 (1957) 249ff.; *ibid.* 188 (1959) 497ff.; Syme, 249, n. 58. Perhaps a measure of S.'s influence is the fact that subsequent writers adopted his choice of 146 B.C. as an epochal year in Roman history. Cf. Pliny, *NH.* 33.150; Vell. Pat. 2.1.1; Florus, 1.33.1; Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 1.30; Orosius, 5.8.2.

There is considerable dispute concerning the specific source of S.'s account of the effects of the Fall of Carthage. Posidonius, supplemented by Polybius for the material on *ambitio* (10.4-11.8), is a leading contender, championed by Klingner and Schur. *Metus Punicus*, which the Scipionic circle used as a political rallying cry, was the topic of a famous debate between the elder Cato and Scipio Nasica on the destruction of Carthage; cf. Florus, 1.31.5; Appian, *Pun.* 69; Plutarch, *Cato M.* 27; Diodorus, 34.33.3-6, and see M. Gelzer, *Ph.* 86 (1931) 271ff.; H. Scullard, *Roman Politics*, Oxford, 1951, 241-3. Since the Cato-Nasica debate was famous and the theory of *metus hostilis* a rhetorical commonplace it seems feasible to assume that this type of material was probably S.'s source.

For treatments of the place of the Fall of Carthage in S.'s scheme and the theory of *metus hostilis* see F. Klingner, *Hermes* 63 (1928) 165ff.; M. Gelzer, *op. cit.*; F. Egermann, *SAWW* 214, 3 (1932); W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, IV; *id.*, *Klio* 11 (1936) 60ff.; K. Vretska, *Gymnasium* (1937) 24ff.; Büchner, 319ff.; Earl, ch. 4.

patebant: conveys the idea of accessibility to something within one's power or acquired as a right. The verb can be used of conquered territories, e.g. 58.9; of public offices or honours, Livy, 4.25.11; of private possessions, Cicero, *Fam.* 6.10.3. The contrary to *patebant* is *clausum esse*, e.g. Cicero, 2*Verr.* 5.16.8 *omnem orbem terrarum qui semper nostris hominibus maxime patuit, civibus Romanis ista defensione praecluseris.* Cf. *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 53; Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.298. *Patere* is used in a different sense in 58.2.

saevire fortuna: cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.1.1 *turbare fortuna coepit.* The phrase *saevire fortuna* is sometimes taken to mean that *fortuna* enters as a *deus ex machina* intervening in the affairs of Rome

om the outside. Klingner's treatment of *fortuna* in *Hermes* 63 (1928) 166 is representative of this view.

S. refers to the concept of *fortuna* as a factor in human affairs nine times in this monograph. There occur what at first sight are contradictory statements concerning *fortuna*, but the contradiction is only an apparent one because the significance and meaning of *fortuna* are formulated in different situations and from different points of view. Most often S. uses the term almost casually, conveying the Greek concept of τύχη, the play of chance, where the question of deliberate choice on the part of individuals or communities ceases to be a factor controlling events. Thus in 8.1 *sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur*, what is meant is that in Athens great intellects were at hand to heighten by their talents *res gestas*, while in Rome comparable intellects, for reasons which were understandable and inevitable, devoted themselves to action only. This chance factor is basically the thought behind 34.2, 41.3, 51.25, 53.3, 58.21.

But S. does introduce an important modification of the concept, *fortuna*, at places where it becomes crucial for his thought. Stated briefly, his thesis is that *virtus* and *fortuna* are fused in contexts of action and activity. The stronger and wider the influence of *virtus*, the more reduced is the influence of *fortuna*. This is essentially the thought of 2.5 *fortuna simul cum moribus inmutatur*. This is the meaning also behind *saevire fortuna coepit* in the context before us. Once *virtus* and the *bonae artes* it implies are laid aside *fortuna* is allowed free play. S., ironically, puts a similar concept into the mouth of Catiline at 20.14. For a discussion of the interplay between *virtus* and *fortuna* see Egermann, *op. cit.*, 10ff.; Büchner, 150, 307.

miscere omnia: cf. 2.3. A term also used by Livy, 1.29.2, 24.13.9 and probably preserved in historiography from the earliest annalists. It became almost a technical term for revolution; cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.6.1. *omnia funditus misceri*; Tacitus, *Dial.* 36.2; Pliny, *Ep.* 1.20.19.

10.2. **qui labores . . . oneri miseriaeque fuere:** cf. *BJ* 41.1ff., *Hist.* 1.11-12M. That demoralisation tends to follow prosperity was a historical commonplace; cf. Thucydides, 3.82.2; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 8.4.14; Theopompus, *FGH* 115. fr. 102; Demosthenes, *Aristoc.* 113. Cato also inveighed strongly and with authority against the increasing moral crisis of the 2nd cent., e.g. 21.8ff., 51.4J;

Fronto, v.d.H 212.10 = Cato, 61.5J; Plutarch, *Cato M.* 8.1, 18.1, 19.4.

qui labores . . . facile toleraverant: another *topos* of *laus maiorum* in the annalistic tradition—Cato, 21.8, 51.4J. For this idea of endurance cf. Cicero, *Off.* 2.45; Livy, 9.19.9. For the asyndeton see Introd. p. 14.

dubias res: cf. 39.3, 51.1, *BJ* 14.5. The expression occurs often in Livy (e.g. 2.50.11) and in Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.62.2), probably preserved in historiography in imitation of epic usage. See E. Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig, 1916, on *Aen.* 6.196.

otium divitiaeque: Ryba (Prague, 1927) and Ernout adopt the text of most MSS and older editions (e.g. Dietsch, Jordan) viz. *otium divitiae* on the grounds that the asyndeton corresponds to the preceding asyndeton *labores pericula*, and the supposition that *-que* was inserted in anticipation of *-que* in *miseriaeque*. See Ernout, *RPh.* (1927) 250. The stronger transmission should be accepted; note the monotony of *-que* . . . *-que*.

optanda alias: the reading of P and adopted by most editors. If it is S.'s meaning that *otium* and *divitiae* are desirable under other circumstances, *alias* is an appropriate word. The stronger transmission, *optanda aliis*, should not, however, be lightly discarded; others may well long for *otium* and *divitias*, but the Romans, had they been able to foresee the future, might have regarded them as *arcenda, detestanda* etc., since they were destined to effect Rome's ruin.

oneri miseriaeque fuere: on the aspect of demoralisation cf. Livy's account of Hannibal's winter camp at Capua: *quos nulla mali vicerat vis, perdidere nimia bona ac voluptates immodicae* (23.18.11). See further U. Knoche, *NJ* (1938) 99ff., 145ff.

10.3. **igitur primo pecuniae . . . malorum fuere:** cf. Thucydides, 3.82.8, where the catchwords πλεονεξία-φιλοτιμία are echoed by S.'s *avaritia* (*pecuniae cupido*)-*ambitio* (*imperi cupido*). For Cato's use of the same concepts see Knoche, *op. cit.* 152. See also E. Burck, *Der Altspr. Unterricht* 1.51.

primo pecuniae deinde imperi cupido: attempts to explain the reversal of the ordering of concepts here as compared with 11.1 *sed primo magis ambitio* etc. are not satisfactory. Earl's view (14) that the idea of "torment" in *exercebat* demands a difference of emphasis would have us believe that *avaritia* lay dormant even though it was a far more widespread vice than *ambitio*; Büchner's

(320) conclusion that these destructive forces are first named in order of importance and then according to their historical sequence involves the interpretation of mere chronological ordering (*primo* . . . *deinde*) as an order of importance. If there is a problem here Nipperdey's suggestion (*Opusc.* 542) viz. a transposition of *imperi* and *cupido* is a most sensible one. But we should not shrink from an obvious explanation: S. is guilty of careless writing.

crevit: *crescere* = *oriri*, a word with an archaic flavour. Cf. *BJ* 4.6; Livy, 2.14.2; *Thes. LL.* 4.1176.

ea . . . fuere: *constructio ad sensum* (Introd. p. 16).

materies omnium malorum: for the general idea cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* 1266b. The effect of *avaritia-ambitio* is discussed in moral terms only in this work. For their effect in terms of politics cf. *BJ* 41-2 and see Earl, 52ff. For *materies* as "root, cause, origin" see *Thes. LL.* 8.463.

10.4-5. **namque avaritia. . . ingenium bonum habere:** S. here summarises all that he considers essential about *avaritia* and *ambitio*. He will expand his treatment in Chs. 11, 13.

10.4. **namque avaritia . . . edocuit:** cf. Cato's statement on the early Romans, 82.10J *avaritiam omnia vitia habere putabant.*

subvortit . . . edocuit: see on *concupivit*, 11.3.

omnia venalia habere: cf. *BJ* 8.1 *Romae omnia venalia esse,* where it assumes political implications of a disastrous kind (e.g. *BJ* 13.5). Economic factors naturally loom larger in the *Bell. Jug.* but they are not entirely neglected in the *Bell. Cat.*, despite S.'s preoccupation with the moral aspect. See, e.g. on 14.2.

10.5. **ambitio multos mortalis . . . quam ingenium bonum habere:** the constituents of this description of *ambitio* have a long history in literature. Thus the words (of Achilles?) in Ennius' drama (*Sc.* 12V) are so similar as to suggest imitation on the part of S.: *eo ego ingenio natus sum: amicitiam atque inimicitiam in frontem promptam gero.* The origin of Ennius' words is obviously the words of Homer's Achilles (*Iliad*, 9.312-3)

ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν
ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.

Cf. Euripides, *Androm.* 451-2 where the accusation is levelled at the Spartans. In Latin literature the idea also appears in Plautus, fr. *Colax*, *Truc.* 226; Cicero, *Fam.* 8.1.3. Similarly for *amicitias inimicitiasque* . . . *aestumare* cf. Thucydides, 3.82.6 and *Bell. Alex.* 24.1.

This whole question of inconsistency of outward behaviour and the intention of the heart, especially in political behaviour, seems to have been a feature S. felt strongly about. In 38.3 the concept of *dissimulatio* is given a specifically political application. In 5.4 the characteristic has been implied of Catiline. This feature appears most strongly in the *Histories*, e.g. 1.12M of those who *sub honesto patrum aut plebis nomine dominationes affectabant*, and the parallel to *voltum quam ingenium bonum habere* as applied to Pompeius (2.16M) *oris probi animo inverecundo*. See further A. R. Hands, *JRS* 49 (1959) 56ff.

subegit: this use of *subigere* as equivalent to *cogere* and followed by the infinitive (cf. 51.18; *BJ* 31.4, 44.4) is not found in Cicero or Caesar. It occurs twice in Plautus, *Amph.* 1143, *Truc.* 783 and is favoured by the poets, e.g. Lucilius (1044 Marx); Lucretius (e.g. 5.1028); Virgil (*Aen.* 12.494). Its use in Livy (e.g. 9.41.5) and Tacitus (e.g. *Ann.* 1.39.3) would indicate its persistence in the language of historiography.

voltum: "mien, appearance", an expression which points closely to an echo from Ennius' *frontem* (above).

ingenium bonum: for S. it is the *ingenium* alone which forms the basis of the distinction between *virtus* and *ambitio*. See on 11.1.

10.6. **haec:** refers to both *avaritia* and *ambitio*. Cf. 11.3 where a metaphor of similar vividness is applied to *avaritia*; *Hist.* 1.77.9M, 4.46M; Seneca, *Helv. de Cons.* 13.2 *avaritia . . . vehementissima generis humani pestis*.

vindicari: could be *vindicari legibus* and refer to sumptuary and extortion laws, but *interdum* suggests acts of punishment and might therefore point to attempts to gain kingship at Rome; the story of Maelius (Dion. Hal., 12.1.1ff.; Livy, 4.13-16) is one example. On the use of the passive historic infinitive see 27.2, n. *fatigari*.

contagio quasi pestilentia invasit: a metaphor used again at 36.5, *BJ* 32.4. S. is no doubt influenced by the powerful description of the plague and its devastating moral effects in Thucydides, 2.47ff. On metaphors in S. see E. Skard, *SO* Suppl. 11 (1943) 141ff. For the absolute use of *invadere* cf. 2.5, *BJ* 41.9; *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.7.4; Livy, 5.13.2. For a similar use of *incedere* cf. 7.3, 13.3, *BJ* 13.7; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.5.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.5.1, 1.55.1.

civitas inmutata: S. has already made the point that the chief product of *virtus* has been *concordia* which brings about the ideal

civitas. This notice of change forms a direct link with the contemporary scene and with Catiline. Cf. 14.1 *in tanta tamque conrupta civitate*.

imperium ex iustissumo . . . factum: some of the details of the deterioration of the *civitas*, which involves both the ruling and the ruled, will be documented by S. in his account of the conspiracy. In the following three chapters he concentrates on the causes of this degeneration. Note the chiasmus (Introd. p. 15).

11.1. **sed primo magis . . . proprius virtutem erat:** see on 10.3 *primo pecuniae* etc. Cf. Plato, *Sympos.* 208c-e for the exercise of honourable ambition (φιλοτιμία), the search for immortality (ἀθάνατον μνήμην ἀρετῆς πέρι).

exercebat: cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.12.4 *sed me illa magis cupido exercet*; 2.12.6 *insomniis exercitus*. Skard's (*Ennius u. S.*, 31) assumption that this is an archaic usage is not supported by the evidence: see *Thes. LL.* 5.1371.38ff.

propius virtutem: cf. *BJ* 18.9, 11. Like its positive form *prope* (e.g. *BJ* 21.2) *propius* can govern the accus., e.g. Caesar, *BG* 4.9.1, 5.37.1; Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.21.1, *Ann.* 13.7.1, 16.11.1. *Propius virtuti* of many codices is probably a scribal emendation.

11.2. **gloriam honorem imperium:** on the asyndeton involving a combination of slogans see Introd. p. 14.

sed ille vera via . . . contendit: with the removal of *metus hostilis*, *ingenium* was debased to *imperi cupido* employing the wrong methods, *dolis atque fallaciis*. Before the Fall of Carthage (chs. 6-9) *ingenium* was exercised for the right ends and by the right means—*vera via* = *bonis artibus*.

vera via: more clearly, *ad gloriam virtutis via grassatur* (*BJ* 1.3). Cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 1.33 *verum iter gloriae*; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.5.8, 2.7.9.

huic . . . contendit: for *hic quia ei bonae artes desunt, dolis* etc. Cf. Livy, 5.1.8 *Romanis etsi quietae res . . . nuntiabantur, tamen . . . ita muniebant*. This could be a deliberate *variatio* inside the antithesis.

dolis atque fallaciis: cf. the idea of *dissimulatio* contained in the definition of *ambitio* in 10.5. On the pursuit of public office in Rome see *Commentariolum Petitionis*; O. Plasberg, *Cicero*, Leipzig, 1926, 64-8; M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität d. r. Republik*, Berlin, 1912, 43ff.

11.3. **avaritia pecuniae studium . . . neque inopia minuitur:** unlike *ambitio*, *avaritia* makes no attempt to conceal its real

nature. This vice, which transforms *honoris cupido* into *ambitio*, is the one on which S. now concentrates and with which he connects the stage of degeneration which contemporary society has reached.

avaritia . . . habet: the variety of meanings which can be attributed to *habere* here is illustrated from Cato, 82.10J *avaritiam omnia vitia habere putabant* ("include"); Cicero, *Fin.* 1.42 *et gubernatoris ars, quia bene navigandi rationem habet* ("consists of"); Cicero, *Fam.* 10.28.1 *ut vestrum illud divinum in rempublicam beneficium nonnullam habeat querellam* ("gives rise to").

concupivit: this use of the perfect in a *sententia*, used also in Catullus, 62.42, also occurs several times in S.—e.g. 10.4, 51.2, 51.11, 58.15. The usage is undoubtedly influenced by the Greek gnomic aorist, especially since this latter is frequent in Thucydides.

venenis malis: *venenum* always occurs in Cicero as a *vox mala*, though its real nature, like that of *facinus*, as a *vox media* is indicated by Cicero's quotation of a law in *pro Cluent.* 148 *qui venenum malum fecit*. Cf. Gellius, 12.9.2; Gaius, *Dig.* 50.16.236. S.'s use of the adjective here may be taken as part of his deliberate archaising tendency (Introd. p. 18).

ea quasi venenis . . . inbuta corpus animumque virilem effeminat: a statement which Gellius found difficult to understand: *quo pacto corpus hominis avaritia effeminat?* (3.1.3). The expression *venenis imbutus* may owe something to the well-known tragic theme of Hercules destroyed by the blood of Nessus; cf. Ovid, *Met.* 9.153 *praetulit imbutam Nesseo sanguine vestem*. The use of *effeminare* instead of a more usual word like *delere* points to the allegorisation of Hercules' death by the Cynics (cf. R. Hölstad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, Diss. Uppsala, 1948). Our chief source for this allegorisation is the 60th speech of Dio Chrysostom where the garment is taken as the symbol of the effemination of Hercules under the influence of Deianira (Dio, 60.8). That the moralising application of this experience was common in Rome by S.'s time is shown by Cicero's rendering of a line from Sophocles (*Trach.* 1075): νῦν δ' ἐκ τοιούτου θῆλυς ηὕρημαι τάλας . . . Cicero's version (*Tusc. Disp.* 2.21): *effeminata virtus adflicta occidit* renders the allegorical significance—Hercules' *virtus* has become effeminate and been overthrown. See E. Skard, *SO* 32 (1956) 107f.

infinita et insatiabilis: *et* occurs only in Gellius, 3.1. The emphasis on the nature of *avaritia* is better achieved by the asyndeton coupled with alliteration of *infinita insatiabilis* where the

weight comes on both concepts, which are further illuminated by the following *neque copia neque inopia*. See A. Kurfess, *PhW* 1927, 1163f., who in his edition wrongly changed his mind.

neque copia neque inopia: on polar expressions in S. see Introd. p. 16. An explanatory clause with particle omitted (Introd. p. 16).

11.4. **sed postquam L. Sulla . . .:** as he has already indicated at 5.6, S. attached particular importance to *Sullae dominatio*. He couples the introduction of *luxuria* into Rome with the army of Sulla; this was an aspect of *avaritia* which affected the younger men in particular and on which he dwells in chs. 12 and 13. Once again he ignores the strict chronology of historical events and uses incident only to illustrate his moral theme. The Sullan regime was one which loomed large in contemporary political thinking, both with regard to the immediate past, the career of Julius Caesar, and to the problems of the present, the uncertainty as to the outcome of Triumviral intrigues.

bonis initiis: Cortius explained *bonis initiis* as a dative, elegantly used for a genitive. His view was defended by A. Biedl, *PhW* 48 (1928) 1148-9, who based his argument for the dative on a second rendering of this passage by Augustine. In *Civ. Dei* 17.20 we have: *hic bonis initiis malos exitus habuit,* while *ibid.* 3.7 we read: *horum bonorum initiorum nondum malos eventus habuit.* Nevertheless, *bonis initiis* here is best taken as ablative absolute.

malos eventus: for the contrast between the start of Sulla's regime and its oppressive close cf. Vell. Pat., 2.25; Cicero, *Off.* 3.87, *pro Rosc. Am.* 130ff.

rapere . . . trahere . . . cupere . . . habere . . . facere: on the use of historic infinitives by S. and his habit of coupling these with finite tenses (e.g. *postquam . . . eventus habuit* in this context) see Introd. p. 20.

rapere . . . trahere: for the doublet cf. *BJ* 41.5 and see Introd. p. 18. It is a combination which occurs in a similar context in Livy, 21.13.9 and points to a common annalistic source. Cf. Plautus, *Pseud.* 138, *Rud.* 853; *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.3.4.

neque modum neque modestiam: a catch-word phrase, reversed in 38.4. Cf. *BJ* 41.9; Plautus, *Bacch.* 613; Livy, 26.48.11; *Thes. LL.* 8.1223.29. On the archaic character of such combinations see Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 361ff.; Hofmann, *Umgangssprache*, 93.

11.5-6. **huc accedebat... omnia polluere:** because of his insistence that *concordia* assured the strength of Rome down to 146 B.C., S. postdates the introduction of *luxuria.* He is in agreement with the annalistic tradition in stating that the first importation of *luxuria* was due to an army from Asia. The annalistic account, represented by Livy, 39.6.5ff., ascribes this to the army of Manlius Vulso; both accounts show a remarkable similarity of description of lax discipline and in listing articles of luxury. S.'s statement: *ibi primum insuevit exercitus populi Romani* etc. cannot be true. There is ample evidence in Polybius, Livy and the annalists (see p. 87) that this was not the first time that a Roman army had so acted.

The close similarity in concept and expression between S. and Livy on this theme suggests a common store of annalistic material. S.'s *luxuriose nimisque liberaliter habuerat* is closely paralleled by Livy, 39.1.4: (*exercitum*) *sub imperio C. Manli solute ac neglegenter habiti sunt*; cf. 2.22.7 *liberaliter habiti*; 39.6.7 *luxuriae . . . peregrinae origo ab exercitu Asiatico invecta in urbem est.* Corresponding to S.'s *loca amoena voluptaria . . . animos molliverant* is Livy's frequent use of *animum mollire,* e.g. 23.16.1 and the ideas contained in the doublet *amoenus-voluptarius,* which had already appeared in Plautus, *Miles,* 641, occur in Livy, e.g. 23.4.4. *Ibi primum . . . sacra profanaque polluere* has a remarkably clear echo in Livy, 25.40. 1-2, especially in the list of items of luxury sought. Livy's *omnia simul divina humanaque iura polluerit* (31.30.4) has a familiar ring, and likewise his use of *mirari* in the same sense as S. (34. 4.4).

11.5. **ductaverat:** cf. 17.7, 19.3. *Ductare* occurs in the sense of *viam monstrare* in Plautus, *Most.* 844 but it is often used in Plautus in the sense of taking home a concubine, e.g. *Asin.* 164, *Men.* 694. This is the meaning which probably provoked Quintilian's remark on S.'s use of the word: *in obscenum intellectum sermo detortus est, ut 'ductare exercitum' et 'patrare bellum' apud Sallustium, dicta sancte et antique ridentibus* . . . (8.3.44). But S.'s use of *ductare* = *huc, illuc ducere* is simply another example of his predilection for the emphatic frequentative, which also carries a suitably archaic flavour (Kroll, 293). See on 2.1 *agitabatur.*

quo sibi fidum faceret: on the use of *quo* = *ut* see Introd. p. 19. In Plautine Latin *quo* is regularly used with a comparative, but exceptions occur at *Amph.* 834, *Rud.* 1329, in Terence, *Heaut.*

127. This is an archaic usage, a solitary example of which occurs in Cicero, *Leg.* 2.65. It is more frequent in Tacitus because of the influence of S. See Bennett, 1. 261; L-H-S 679. Note the epic *fidus* in place of *fidelis*, more favoured by Cicero and Caesar.

luxuriose . . . habuerat: for the expression *habere aliquem male, liberaliter*, etc. = *tractare*, cf. 14.7, *BJ* 103.5; Livy, 29.8.6, 37.34.7, 39.1.4.

loca: S. uses both plurals of *locus*, with *loca* occurring again at 27.2, 27.4, 30.3, 43.2, 52.13 and often in the *Bell. Jug.* He does not, however, always strictly observe the distinction enunciated by Krebs (*Antibarb.* 666f.) of *loci* for single places, *loca* for places connected with each other, equivalent to a region as in Plautus, *Pseud.* 594-5 *hi loci sunt atque hae regiones. Loca*, however, seems to be the more common form; cf. Plautus, *Cist.* 677, *Rud.* 111, *Trin.* 863; Cicero, *Fam.* 9.2.5; Caesar, *BG* 2.4.2; Livy, 1.1.5 etc. See Wackernagel, 1.89.

11.6. **amare potare:** a catch-word phrase repeated in *BJ* 85.41. It was almost a *topos* in Greek poetry, e.g. Aristophanes, *Frogs* 739; cf. Callimachus, *Anth. Pal.* XII, 118. It found its way into Roman comedy where it is expressed in various ways, e.g. Plautus, *Stich.* 446 *ne vos miremini homines servolos potare amare*; *Most.* 36, *Pseud.* 1134; Terence, *Adelph.* 33, 61, 102, 470. See G. Pascucci, *AR* 5 (1960) 219-22; V. Pisani, *Studi Castiglioni* II, Firenze, 1960, 757f.

signa tabulas pictas vasa caelata: for the asyndeton see Introd. p. 14.

mirari: Livy refers the beginning of this outlook to the capture of Syracuse (25.40.2); others, e.g. Vell. Pat., 1.13.4 and cf. Juvenal, 11.100f. to the capture of Corinth.

delubra spoliare . . . omnia polluere: in strong contrast to the *religio* of the early Romans (9.2). It is a point taken up again in detail by S. in 12.3f. For the polar expression *sacra profanaque* see Introd. p. 16, and for the use of the strong word *polluere* cf. *BJ* 41.9; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.2.5.

11.7. **igitur ii milites . . . victis fecere:** again the contrast with the former exercise of *virtus in pace* is underlined—9.3 *ubi pax evenerat aequitate*; cf. 6.5.

nihil relicui fecere: again at 28.4, 52.4; cf. 20.13 for *relicui* as a normal partitive genitive. The construction here is similar to that in the phrases *lucri, compendi, aequi, boni facere*, an adverbial

genitive restricted to genitives in *-i* in early Latin, but later extended to genitives in *-is*, e.g. Livy, 1.25.13 *dicionis alienae*. See *Thes. LL.* 6.112.64ff.; L-H-S, 71f.

11.8. **quippe secundae res . . . temperarent:** an idea repeated at 31.1, *BJ* 40.5, 41.3, *Hist.* 1.11M *discordia et avaritia atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala.* Cf. Livy, 22.22.19, 45.31.5 *et al.*

quippe: used as equivalent to *nam* frequently in S. It adds an element of "as is well known", cf. *nempe*, e.g. 13.2, 19.2, 52.20, *BJ* 1.3 *et saepe*. It is an archaic usage, cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 37, *Trin.* 1049.

ne: *nedum* is found in many codices, but mainly *manu correctrice*, and it is the reading cited by Priscian (3.503.9K); in 100.1 however Priscian cites *ne* as do Sacerdos (6.469.9K) and Dositheus (7.421.17K). Only a few instances of this contraction occur, e.g. Cicero, *Fam.* 9.26.2 *me vero nihil istorum, ne iuvenem quidem, movit umquam, ne nunc senem.* Cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 330; Livy, 3.52.9 (Ogilvie's note). This use of *nedum* occurs only after a preceding negative in Cicero, but after affirmative sentences in Livy and Tacitus. Sometimes the negative may, as here, lie in the preceding thought without actually being expressed.

victoriae temperarent: with a dative, *temperare* means "to set bounds to", "to moderate"; with the accusative it means "to regulate", "to arrange". Cf. Heraeus on Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.1.3. For the construction with the dative cf. Livy, 33.20.6 (*irae*), 3.52.9 (*imperiis*) and Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.31.3. Cicero constructs *temperare* with a dative of person only, equivalent to *parcere*. *Obtemperarent* of a few codices is meaningless. *Temperarent* is final in origin; the sense of a *nedum* clause can be expressed in a normal negative final clause as in Plautus, *Amph.* 330 *vix incedo inanis, ne ire posse cum onere existimes*; cf. *Miles* 127. See L-H-S 618; S. A. Handford, *The Latin Subjunctive*, Methuen, 1947, sec. 56.

12.1. **postquam divitiae . . . coepit:** S. comes to the contemporary scene, to the moral climate wherein *ambitio* is a prostitution of *honoris cupido*. The total picture recalls the gloomy description of the breakdown in moral values in Thucydides, 3.82.

divitiae: for other assessments of riches as the criterion of good and evil cf. *Hist.* 1.12M; *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.7.6; Juvenal, 6.294ff.

potentia: to be distinguished from *potestas*. The former denotes power attained by personal means, wealth, influence etc., and

used largely for personal ends. The latter is used of power that is associated with public office, properly constituted authority. S.'s selection of the term here further underlines his meaning. See further on 20.8.

sequebatur: the verb is singular, not because it agrees with the nearest nominative, but because the three nouns are aspects of a whole. Cf. 39.4 *clades atque calamitas . . . oppressisset*, 51.42 *virtus atque sapientia . . . fuit*. *-que* is not used in such examples, whereas in cases such as 25.5 *multae facetiae multusque lepos inerat*, the verb does agree in number with the nearest subject. On the meaning of *sequebatur* as "came of necessity" see on 54.6.

paupertas probo haberi: contrast the praise of Athens in Thucydides, 2.40.1, and of Rome in Livy, *praef.* 11 *ubi tantus ac tamdiu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit.*

innocentia pro malevolentia: "abstinence was considered by the prodigal as a reflection on themselves". *Innocentia* is contrasted with *avaritia* and is equivalent to *pecuniae abstinentia* as in *BJ* 46.1. This is the meaning behind 54.6 *cum innocente abstinentia certabat*; cf. *BJ* 85.18. Compare the meaning "stingy" attached to *malignus*, e.g. Plautus, *Bacch.* 401.

haberi . . . duci . . . coepit: a passive infinitive is rare as the object of the active *coepi* and never occurs with the present *incipio*. The tendency is for a passive infin. governed by *coepi* to attract *coepi* into the same voice; thus *circumveniri innocentes . . . coepere* (51.40) would normally be written *circumveniri . . . coepti sunt.* The earlier usage seems, in the classical period, to be confined to poets and historians, e.g. Lucretius, 2.613; Horace, *Ep.* 1.15.27; Ovid, *Met.* 3.106; Sallust, *BJ* 41.10; Livy, 22.4.4, 35.35.10; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.16.1; Suetonius, *Tib.* 75.3. See Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, 2.123.

12.2. **igitur ex divitiis . . . neque moderati habere:** cf. *Hist.* 1.16M for the rapidity of the onset of degeneration (*torrentis modo*) because of the association of the *iuventus* with *avaritia-luxuria.*

ex divitiis: "on account of"; cf. 8.1 *ex lubidine*, 14.6 *ex aetate*, 26.1, 42.3, 49.2, *BJ* 32.5 *et al.* The difference might be explained as that the simple ablative of cause gives the immediately operative cause while the addition of *ex* indicates the influence of something over the passage of time.

iuventutem: this emphasis on the connection between *luxuria* and the *iuvenes*, which is repeated strongly in *Hist.* 1.16M, appears

also in *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.6.1, whereas in *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.7ff. these vices are directly associated with the *nobiles*. Hence S.'s *iuventus* has been interpreted as applicable only to the *nobiles* (W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, 27). But the view that *iuvenes* are utilmately responsible for the failure of the state is due rather to the influence of Greek philosophical thinking as reflected, e.g. in Polybius, 31.25 and Posidonius (Diodorus, 37.3), than to any partisan bias incorporated from contemporary political thinking. In S. the *iuventus* includes the young men, without regard to their origin, who have become the victims of sloth and prodigality. This concept is not confined to the *nobiles* (cf. 17.6, 37.7). Ch. 17 makes the first specific mention of the *nobiles*; all that was said before applies to the state as a whole, and to its younger citizens as such, not as members of a party or a class.

By this emphasis on the young (cf. 13.4, 14.5, 16.1, 17.6, 37.7) S., who is merely reiterating the fact that the conspiracy received its chief support from the *iuvenes*—cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.23, *pro Mur.* 49, *pro Cael.* 12f.—anticipates an element of the narrative proper, the general character of the conspiratorial group, 14.1-16.5. Thereby he links up the whole thought developed in his introduction to the story of the conspiracy. See further K. Vretska, *Gymnasium* (1937) 30ff.; W. Steidle, *Historia*, Einzelschr. 3, 1958.

rapere consumere etc.: note the succession of historic infinitives. See Introd. p. 20.

pudorem pudicitiam: a common alliterative doublet; cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 840. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.25 gives the possible opposites: *pudor-petulantia*; *pudicitia-stuprum*. *Pudor* conveys the general concept, *pudicitia* the particular one. S. expands his meaning in 13.3, 14.7. On the asyndeton see Introd. p. 14.

promiscua . . . habere: goes with *pudorem pudicitiam*, *divina atque humana*. It does not mean "they made no distinction between" but rather "they cared for neither . . . nor . . .". Probably influenced by the expression *susque deque habere* (e.g. Plautus, *Amph.* 886) "to be indifferent about", *promiscua* here means roughly the same as *vilia* (Wirz), as implied in *BJ* 31.9 *leges, maiestas vostra, divina et humana omnia hostibus tradita sunt.* Cf. Tacitus, *Germ.* 5.5 *promiscua ac vilia mercantibus.*

nihil pensi neque moderati: *pensi* is a normal value genitive, *moderati*, a partitive, is drawn by zeugma into S.'s favourite construction, *pensi habere*. The thought "they had no (moral)

values and showed no restraint" is clearly echoed in Lactantius, *Inst.* 6.1.8. *nihil denique moderati aut pensi habent, dummodo auro coruscant* etc.

12.3-4. **operae pretium est . . . licentiam eripiebant:** the contrast is made with the *religio maiorum,* that aspect of their *virtus* which also expressed itself in *fides* towards friends, *aequitas* towards defeated enemies (9.2-3).

12.3. **operae pretium est:** cf. in a very similar context Livy, 3.26.7 *operae pretium est audire.* Fraenkel (*Horace,* 81) 'an old introductory formula which in all probability originally belonged to forensic oratory' illustrates its early origin by reference to Aristophanes, *Equites,* 624; Andocides, 1.124; Ennius, *Ann.* 465V; Plautus, *Cas.* 879; Terence, *Andr.* 217. See also H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen z. altlat. Dichtersprache,* Berlin, 1934, 52.

cognoveris: this coupling of a principal clause in the present tense with a subordinate clause in the future perfect is a favourite construction of S. (Introd. p. 19). For its occurrence in other authors see the references in B. Edmar, *Studien z. d. Epistulae ad Caesarem* etc., 1931, 100.

in urbium modum exaedificatas: see below on 13.1-2.

visere templa deorum . . . decorabant: cf. Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.25-6; Livy, 3.26.7ff.

religiosissumi mortales: cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 42a (*Leg.* 902). Cicero, *Tim.* 43 translates: *satis autem et quasi sparsis animis fore uti certis temporum intervallis oreretur animal quod esset ad cultum deorum aptissimum.* See L. Alfonsi, *Aevum* 35 (1961) 506.

12.4. **verum illi:** *verum* is a strongly emphatic word here—"the truth is that . . .". Cf. Terence, *Andr.* prol. 4.

12.5. **at hi contra . . . imperio uti:** cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.* 7.5.83 for the idea that *imperium* is not a licence to commit evil. S. is here adapting for the purpose of censure a *topos* of *laus Romae.* The correct procedure is indicated by the Senate's reply to envoys seeking a ruling on a border dispute between Masinissa and the Carthaginians, Livy, 42.24.9 *Carthaginiensibus victis se et urbem et agros concessisse, non ut in pace eriperent per iniuriam quae iure belli non ademissent.*

ignavissumi homines: note the deliberate and most suitable *variatio* of *religiosissumi mortales—ignavissumi homines—fortissumi viri.*

id demum esset: on the parataxis resulting from the repetition

of the subject by means of *is*, *ea*, *id* see Introd. p. 15 and 8.1 n. *ea.*

13.1-2. **nam quid ... per turpitudinem properabant:** reference has been made (p. 86) to the curious repetition in ch. 13 of ideas already dealt with in ch. 12. Here an aspect of *luxuria* already mentioned in 12.3 is repeated. The misgivings aroused by the building-frenzy of rich Romans is almost a commonplace in Roman literature. Cato refers to it explicitly 55.9J (cf. 44.9J) *dicere possum quibus villae atque aedes aedificatae atque expolitae maximo opere citro atque ebore atque pavimentis Poenicis sient.* On the *luxuria* practised by Lucullus see Cicero, *Leg.* 3.30. Cf. also Horace, *Od.* 3.1.33ff.; Seneca, *Ep.* 89.21ff., *Benef.* 7.10; Val. Max., 4.4.7; Juvenal, 14.86ff.

The ostentation displayed in magnificent villas and large estates is the expression of *luxuria* on the part of the very rich, some of whom belonged to the ruling class. But the tastes and practices which needed wealth for their gratification (13.3-5) were common both to those who had money and those who had either dissipated their wealth or had for some reason been dispossessed or disappointed in their hopes of acquiring wealth. It was from the impoverished younger set whose taste for *luxuria* persisted that Catiline expected support for his programme.

The picture of expenditure and concentration of wealth implicit in such descriptions as these, the differentiation in wealth inside the upper classes, the wide gulf between these groups and the Roman plebs are referred to specifically in chs. 20-21, 37-39 and 52. The impact on the political situation of such economic differentation is implied in S.'s account, although, becausč of his concentration on the moral aspect, it does not receive an extended or detailed treatment. See further on the chapters mentioned.

13.1. **subvorsos montes maria constrata:** neither the argument of Dietsch in favour of the alternative *contracta* (he compares Horace, *Od.* 3.1.33) nor of Kritz in favour of *constructa* (he assumed that S. had the fish-ponds of the *piscinarii* in mind) seriously contests the strongly supported *constrata.* Moreover Jerome, *Ep.* 60.18 *Xerxes rex potentissimus qui subvertit montes, maria constravit* seems to be imitating S. here. S.'s use of *a privatis* could suggest a contrast in his mind to the marvels recounted of the Persian king; cf. Juvenal, 10.174, who also uses *constrata. Constrata* "bridged over" would also fit in with S.'s statement in 12.3 *domos*

atque villas . . . exaedificatas where the necessary land is acquired either by bridging over the sea or by extending the land at the expense of the sea, *molibus iniectis* (cf. *extruendo mari* 20.11). See Ph. Klimscha, *ZÖG* 1878, 166ff.

13.2. **quippe:** see on 11.8.

per turpitudinem: see Introd. p. 20 on S.'s use of *per*.

13.3. **sed lubido stupri . . . luxu antecapere:** the vices connected with *luxuria* and the means used to gratify such appetites were well-known topics in ancient literature and S.'s enumeration here is a product of his reading. A passage in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (2.1.30) which was well-known to Romans—cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.118, *Fam.* 5.12.3; Sil. Ital. 15.22ff.; Quintilian, 9.2.36; Pliny, *Ep.* 7.32.2—appears a likely source for S. in view of the closeness of parallels in both passages. Thus *viri muliebria pati* echoes Xenophon's γυναιξὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσι χρωμένῃ; *vescendi causa terra marique omnia exquirere* is less strongly paralleled by ὀψοποιοὺς μηχανωμένῃ and οἴνους . . . πολυτελεῖς παρασκευάζῃ; and *nec famem aut sitim . . . opperiri* recalls πρὶν μὲν πεινῆν ἐσθίουσα, πρὶν δὲ διψῆν πίνουσα. But, as usual with S., certainty of allocation of source is not easily attained.

ganeae: *ganeones*, as Nonius (171L) says, *a ganeis dicti et sunt loca vinolentiae et libidini apta*. Cf. Donatus, *ad Ter. Adelph.* 359; Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.7, *in Pis.* 13.

cultus: used here in a particularly bad sense not often met with. Livy, 29.21.13 speaks *de cultu ac desidia imperatoris*. Cf. Livy, 21.39.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.30.2. See *Thes. LL.* 4.1337.47ff.

incesserat: cf. 7.3 and see note on 10.6 *invasit*.

viri muliebria pati: cf. Clement Alex., *Paedag.* 3.3.21 τὰ γυναικῶν οἱ ἄνδρες πεπόνθασιν and the use of γυναικοπαθεῖν in Athenaeus. Cf. also Curtius, 6.6.8; Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.36.4; Ulpian, *Dig.* 3.1.6.

pudicitiam in propatulo habere: Fabri remarks on S.'s fondness for using such phrases as *in propatulo habere*, e.g. *in incerto habere* (41.1, *BJ* 46.8), *in excelso agere* (51.12), *in dubio esse* (52.6), *in extremo esse* (52.11). Cf. Gellius, 18.10.8; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.33.3. Here *in propatulo habere* is equivalent to *vulgare, prostituere*; cf. Suetonius, *Nero* 29 *suam quidem pudicitiam usque adeo prostituit* etc. S.'s statement probably reflects the moralising attitude of Cato: *neque pudicitiam multi facit* (40.5J).

vescendi causa terra marique omnia exquirere: because this phrase is not exactly paralleled in Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.30

Skard (*SO* Suppl. 15 (1956)) and Avenarius (*SO* 33 (1957) 48ff.) proposed Xenophon's *Ages.* 9.3 and 4 as S.'s source. Gellius, 6.16.5 gives a list of places from Varro's satirical poem περὶ ἐδεσμάτων, and Lucan (4.375) appears to imitate S.'s phrase: *quaesitorum terra pelagoque ciborum ambitiosa fames*; cf. *id.*, 1.160ff. See also Horace, *Sat.* 2.2; Seneca, *Helv. de Cons.* 9, *Benef.* 7.9.

non famem ... aut ... neque ... neque: on this method of sentence connection see Introd. p. 15.

antecapere: apart from a definition by Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 1.43, this verb does not occur before S. (*Thes. LL.* 2.138) and probably owes its appearance in later writers to him. The fact that *anticipare* also exists may partly explain its rarity. *Antecapere* also occurs at 32.1, 55.1, *BJ* 21.3, 50.1. Cicero would probably have written *praecipere* in such a context. The meaning here is not so much *cibum etc. capere antequam esuriant, sitiant,* but rather *appetitum arte excitare,* without waiting for the normal demands of nature.

13.4. **haec iuventutem ... incendebant:** on the relationship of this sentence to the preceding historic infinitives see Introd. p. 20.

13.5. **carebat:** *carere* here carries more than the simple notion "to be deprived of". Simple deprivation (*carere*) is followed by the notion *vix ferre poterat ut sine lubidinibus esset* and ultimately by the notion contained in *vacare, liberum esse ab aliqua re* as in Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.88; cf. Terence, *Hecyr.* 663; Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 56. The *iuvenes* were so corrupted by *malae artes* that they were never free from *cupidines,* and the more they were affected by these *artes, eo profusius* they were given over to all manner of indulgence.

Chs. 14-16: *Catiline's Associates*

S. makes reference to the support given to Catiline not only in these chapters but, in the light of a developing situation, also at 24.3, 28.4, and ch. 37. In the later references some significant changes of emphasis occur and these will be referred to in their contexts. For a general treatment of the developing nature of the support given to Catiline see Syme, 76ff.

The unusually lengthy treatment given to this facet of the conspiracy (chs. 14-16) is explained by S.'s intention to stress his concept of the real nature of the conspiracy. He has firmly placed the conspiracy within the framework of the moral degeneration

of the Romans, and here Catiline, entirely given over to *lubido, avaritia, luxuria,* heads a band of *perdita iuventus* the members of which exhibit the same propensities and whose main object is the acquiring of the means to pander to their particular vices.

Though S. with his usual brevity enumerates in ch. 14 much the same groups as figure in much more extended fashion in Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.18-23, the emphasis is on the moral aspect; social, economic and political factors will receive a fuller treatment at appropriate points in the narrative. Thus at 20.2-17 the aspirations of this motley crew of self-seekers are given sharper expression in political terms. But in all references to the following of Catiline the aspect of moral turpitude remains prominent; for instance, the influence of Sulla's victory and the *luxuria* and *lubido* of Sullan colonists remains a constant feature of the support—16.4, 21.4, 28.4, 37.6, 37.9. The motives of the various groups enumerated in ch. 37, when the conspiracy was in full swing, are in no way different from those which are here attributed to the earliest associates. All of them thrive on *malum publicum*; of all of them it can be said *quo minus mirandum est homines egentes, malis moribus maxuma spe rei publicae iuxta ac sibi consuluisse* (37.8).

14.1-4. **In tanta tamque conrupta . . . efficiebatur:** the prototype of this description of Catiline's circle is very probably the famous description in Theopompus of the circle of Philip II of Macedon. This passage (*FGH* 115. frr. 224-5) reappears to varying extent in Athenaeus, 4.167b and 6.260d-261a; Polybius, 8.9.5-13; Demetrius, *de Eloc.* 27. That S. was influenced by it is indicated by his almost literal rendering of a sentence in Theopompus: *quod si quis etiam . . . ceteris efficiebantur* (14.4) corresponding to εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ τοιοῦτός τις <ὢν> ἐληλύθει ὕπο τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς διαίτης τῆς Μακεδονικῆς ταχεὼς ἐκείνοις ὅμοιος ἐγίνετο (fr. 224; Athenaeus, 4.167b).

If S. has used this Hellenistic prototype he has done so in a characteristic way. Theopompus' description is about four times longer but provides hardly more concrete details; it is padded out with accretions of personal feeling, mythological references etc. S. is strictly practical; there are no emotional overtones, no personal outbursts; simply a delineation of the sociological and moral factors underlying the conspiracy (cf. Büchner, 329). He is far more restrained than Cicero (*in Cat.* 2.7).

14.1. **In tanta tamque conrupta civitate:** these words link

up the introductory analysis of the moral climate in Rome with the fact of Catiline's conspiracy. His use of the word *civitas* further indicates that he is concerned with citizen morality in general, not, as E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 554ff., maintained, the *mores* simply of the ruling class. See, e.g. on 6.2.

flagitiorum . . . catervas: the alternative reading *flagitiosorum atque facinerosorum* has been preferred by those, e.g. Novak (see *Bursian Jahresber.* 101 (1878-98) 231), who object to the use of *caterva* with abstract words. It is true that *caterva* (*Thes. LL.* 3.609.57ff.) is rarely used of things, but cf. Gellius, 15.2.3 *vili et incondita verborum caterva*; Augustine, *Contra Jul.* 6.18.56 *catervas desideriorum malorum.* J. P. Binsfeld (*Rh. Mus.* 1866, 485) proposed to read *stipationem* instead of *stipatorum catervas* and thus retain the abstracts *flagitiorum* etc. Such emendations are unnecessary. The concrete *stipatorum* intervenes after *flagitiorum* etc. and facilitates the use of *catervas*; apart from that, S. regularly uses the abstract for the concrete, e.g. 8.3 *ingenia*; 24.4 *servitia* (cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.65). Plautus makes frequent use of *flagitium* and *scelus* for a villain, e.g. (*flagitium*) *Asin.* 473, *Cas.* 552, *Men.* 489; (*scelus*) *Bacch.* 1095, *Miles* 827, *Pers.* 217, cf. Terence, *Andr.* 607, 884. Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 134 has *derversorium flagitiorum omnium* and in *2Verr.* 5.1.4 we read *flagitiorum omnium vitiorumque princeps.*

14.2. **inpudicus adulter ganeo manu ventre pene:** note the marked asyndeton (Introd. p. 14). It is not unlikely that this passage suffered from the attention of over-zealous scribes; it has attracted much comment subsequently. Fronto (v.d.H 147) cites the passage without *inpudicus adulter ganeo* and the words have been dismissed as a gloss, e.g. by A. Nitzschner, *De locis Sallustianis qui apud scriptores et grammaticos veteres leguntur,* Diss. Göttingen, 1884. *Alea* appears in some codices but in a variety of positions. Hence Wölfflin's proposal (*Bursian Jahresber.* 2.1662) to read *impudicus ganeo aleo* to connect by chiasmus with *manu ventre pene.* Waltz (*REA*, 1904, 219) proposed *impudicus aleator ganeo,* omitting *adulter* as Wölfflin had done, deeming it unnecessary because of *inpudicus.* Waltz justified his order of words as not neatly corresponding on the grounds of the difficulty of pronouncing them if they were put in the order of symmetry.

Nearly all editors have accepted *inpudicus adulter ganeo* etc. as satisfactory in sense; Wirz defends this reading by maintaining that only two vices are under discussion, as in 13.3, and the same

manner of expression is used in both passages, i.e. two words for the concept *lubido*, one for *ganeo*; thus *manu* is to be associated with *ventre* and connected with *ganeo*; Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.23 is cited in support of this view. I do not find this argument totally convincing: *ceterique cultus* refers in 13.3 to other vices besides *lubido* etc. and clearly articulated chiasmus is a notable feature of S.'s style. However, while proposals such as that of Wölfflin are attractive they are not compelling enough to allow us to discard with equanimity the commonly accepted reading.

pene: S. in general avoids the obscene, the erotic and the horrific. In this case he may be following an older model: Piso Frugi (*HRR* fr. 40) uses *peni dediti* of the younger generation (cf. fr. 38). S.'s attitude to such material is shown by the caution with which he refers to pederastic practices among the Catilinarians at 14.7. On scenes of horror see further on ch. 22, 55.5.

alienum aes grande: on the inversion of the normal and expected order *aes alienum* (*Thes. LL.* 1076.51ff.) see Introd. p. 16. The normal order is observed at 16.4, 20.13, 40.4 and the same phrase occurs as *aes alienum grande* at 24.3.

quicumque . . . quique . . . praeterea . . . ad hoc: on the use of *copulae* in a Sallustian period see Introd. p. 15f. On the use of *ii*, although perhaps justified here by the intervening sentences, see Introd. p. 15 and 8.1 n. *ea*.

14.3. **parricidae:** see 31.8 n. *parricidam*.

Catilinae proxumi: *Catilinae* is genitive, governed by *proxumi familiaresque*. Cf. *BJ* 80.3 *regis Bocchi proxumos*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.26.1, 13.13.3.

14.4. **a culpa vacuos:** *vacuus* is also used with the simple ablative, e.g. 51.1. A rarer construction with the genitive occurs at *BJ* 90.1.

inciderat: *incidere* is a verb often used in connection with misfortune, the onset of disease etc., of a quarry falling into the hands of a hunter, and so is apt to S.'s meaning here.

par similisque: Wirz quotes Quintilian, 10.1.102 *pares eos magis quam similes* (cf. 12.10.71) and explains "alike in degree and kind". Livy, 45.43.2 *similia omnia magis visa hominibus quam paria* supports this distinction; cf. Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 2.153. But since he is so fond of doublets, S. may not have intended any subtle distinction here. See G. Bendz, *Arctos* V (1967) 23-7.

14.5. **sed maxume adulescentium familiaritates:** a recurring

factor in descriptions of the following of Catiline, e.g. 17.6, 38.1.

molles etiam et [aetate] fluxi: the codices read variously: *molles etiam et fluxi*; *molles aetate et fluxi*; *molles et aetate fluxi*. Jordan's conjecture that *aetate* intruded from the following sentence is a sound one. However both Jordan and Wirz also omit *etiam*, the reading of P. *Etiam* is not necessary but it makes perfectly good sense; superfluity is no reason for deletion; cf. Lucilius, 425 (Marx) *tener ipse etiam atque puellus*. For *fluxi* cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.38.2; Suetonius, *Tib.* 52.1.

14.6. **postremo:** a favourite summing up word of S., equivalent to *ut paucis complectar*. Cf. 14.3, 20.12, 23.3, 51.9, 51.38, 61.5.

obnoxios: can mean both "culpable" (*ob noxam*) and "pledged to, subject to" (*necto, nexus*). Here it combines both meanings; cf. Plautus, *Truc.* 835 *ego tibi me obnoxium esse fateor culpae compotem*. See *Glotta* 8 (1917) 298.

14.7. **scio fuisse . . . fama valebat:** carefulness of reporting in this instance may be S.'s attempt to fulfil the duty of historian as detailed in 3.2; an indication of his reluctance to express as fact items of rumour he is not prepared to vouch for. On the other hand, with *ex aliis rebus magis* he does convey the impression that there were grounds for such beliefs concerning the Catilinarians. See also on 19.4-5.

frequentabat: on several occasions in S. a relative clause with an indicative verb occurs in conjunction with *oratio obliqua* where it is difficult to decide whether it is S.'s own comment or is really part of the original speech. Cf. 50.3 *consul refert quid de his fieri placeat qui in custodiam traditi erant*; 27.4, *BJ* 63.1.

honeste . . . habuisse: see on 11.5 n. *luxuriose . . . habuerat*.

quam quod quoiquam: on the use of *quisquam* see on 5.3.

compertum foret: it is undoubted that *fore* with the past participle of both deponent and passive verbs has a future meaning, e.g. *BJ* 14.14, 28.4. *Forem* occasionally has a future meaning in Cicero, e.g. *de Rep.* 2.24, *Att.* 7.21.2, 10.14.3, but both he and Caesar avoid its use with a perfect passive participle. For metrical reasons the early playwrights used *forem* both alone and with a perfect participle as equivalent to *essem*, e.g. Plautus, *Most.* 494, *Rud.* 552f. This usage was retained as an archaism in prose, e.g. *Bell. Afr.* 26.3, 91.2 and especially in S. who was followed by Nepos, *Lys.* 3.5; Livy (with both forms) 39.47.6. See L-H-S, 394f.; Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, 2.283f.; Kroll, *Glotta* 15 (1927) 302; and for

Plautus and S. in particular, Lowrance, *TAPhA* 62 (1931) 169ff. In 21.1 it is possible that *futura esset* could be substituted for *foret*. But here with *compertum foret* we are dealing with a firm statement and *foret* is equivalent to *esset*.

15.1. **Iam primum adulescens ... contra ius fasque:** here S. fits Catiline into the framework of the vices which chiefly characterise the group from which he drew his most influential and most lasting support. The accent is on sexual immorality and murder, a complete disregard of human and divine law, a background which makes Catiline eminently suitable to be the leader of kindred spirits. That serious danger to the Republic could issue from such a source is S.'s justification for selecting this episode on the grounds of its *sceleris atque periculi novitas*.

There is sufficient evidence available to show that S. is here repeating contemporary charges against Catiline. The somewhat vague manner in which he refers to specific crimes may reflect a scrupulous regard for the state of the evidence available to him. It may also, allied with the omission of other well-attested and lurid episodes in Catiline's career, embraced in the colourless *multa nefanda . . . alia huiusce modi*, once again attest S.'s attitude to events—namely his use of incidents merely to illustrate and develop a major concept under discussion.

cum virgine nobili: the identity of this female remains a mystery. The daughter of this affaire is mentioned in terms of incest by Plutarch, *Cic.* 10; in terms of incestuous marriage by Cicero, *in Tog. Cand.*: *ex eodem stupro tibi et uxorem et filiam invenisti* (Asconius 91C). The same charge is brought, so Asconius reports, in a speech by L. Lucceius and Asconius confesses his inability to ascertain the names of the women in question: *nomina harum mulierum nondum inveni.*

cum sacerdote Vestae: instead of the more usual *cum virgine Vestali*, probably to avoid repetition. There is covert allusion in Cicero, *in Tog. Cand.* (Asconius 91C) to an affair of the Vestal virgins in 73. Cicero could not exploit this juicy scandal more fully because Fabia, accused by Clodius of adultery with Catiline, was acquitted by reason of the powerful advocacy of Cato, Catulus and Cicero. She was, moreover, half-sister of Cicero's wife Terentia—Asconius 91C; Orosius, 6.3.1. On Vestals see F. Altheim, *History of Roman Religion*, trans. Mattingly, Methuen, 1938. 88ff.; K. Latte, *Röm. Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1960; Ogilvie on Livy, 1.20.2.

alia huiusce modi contra ius fasque: e.g. the incest with his own daughter, referred to above. There is no mention of the murders perpetrated during the Sullan terror, e.g. that of M. Marius Gratidianus (Asconius 90C); cf. 84, 87) nephew of Marius, first cousin of Cicero's father (F. Münzer, *RE* XIV 1825ff.) and, according to S. himself (*Hist.* 1.45M), brother-in-law to Catiline. Three other murders, with names furnished by Cicero, are alleged for the same period (Asconius 84C). *Commentariolum Petitionis* 9 alleges the murder of Q. Caecilius (cf. Asconius 84C) also claimed to be Catiline's brother-in-law. Plutarch, *Sulla* 32, states that Catiline murdered his own brother, but his statement lacks support.

huiusce modi: occurs often in S., e.g. 20.1, 32.3, 50.5, 51.40 *et al. Huius modi* never occurs. *Huiusce modi* also occurs in Cicero, e.g. *pro Rosc. Am.* 22, 105 etc. The form is prominent in early Latin poetry. See Neue-Wagener, 2.414; Sommer, 424.

contra ius fasque: cf. Isidorus, Orig. 5.2.2 *fas lex divina est, ius lex humana.*

15.2. **postremo captus . . . scelestis nuptiis fecisse:** a periodic structure, but marked by a Thucydidean type of *variatio*; thus *captus* is to be taken as nominative to *creditur* which follows much later. The personal construction of *creditur* was a normal one by S.'s time, and although *pro certo* goes more naturally with an impersonal construction it is here transferred by analogy to the personal construction.

Aureliae Orestillae: daughter of Cn. Aufidius Orestes, consul in 71. Syme (85), pointing to Cicero's charge: *Cum deprehendebare in adulteriis, cum deprehendebas adulteros ipse, cum ex eodem stupro tibi et uxorem et filiam invenisti* (*apud* Asconium, 91C) and to Asconius' comment: *Nomina harum mulierum nondum inveni,* is undoubtedly right in holding that the allusion points to Orestilla.

nubere . . . dubitabat: the infinitive after *dubitare,* normal in negative and interrogative sentences, is rare in affirmative sentences. It occurs in Cicero, e.g. *Nat. Deor.* 1.113, *Att.* 10.3a.2. See 5.9 n. *hortari*, 52.24 n. *coniuravere* and Introd. p. 20.

pro certo creditur . . . nuptiis fecisse: a phrase believed by some to have been taken from Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.14 *nuper cum morte superioris uxoris novis nuptiis locum vacuefecisses, nonne etiam alio incredibili scelere hoc scelus cumulavisti?* A similar description occurs in Livy, 1.46.9 (*Tarquinius et Tullia*) *prope continuatis funeribus cum domos vacuas novo matrimonio fecissent, iunguntur*

nuptiis (Ogilvie's note). In all three cases there seems to be a personal variation in the phrasing of what Skard (*SO* Suppl. 15 (1956) 57ff.) believes to be a traditional motif derived from early tragedy and going back ultimately to the ἀνόσιος γάμος-γάμος ἄγαμος *topos* (cf. Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 945; Euripides, *Elect.* 600, 926; Sophocles, *Oed.* 1214; Euripides, *Hel.* 690) which was the subject of some of the greatest tragedy-cycles. The name Orestilla may have directed S.'s mind to the story of Orestes and led to his selection of an image which was to be found in the annalistic traditions; cf. Dion. Hal. 4.30.1, speaking of Tarquinius, τὰ προτέλεια τῶν ἀνοσίων γάμων διαπραξάμενος.

necato filio: the reference to Catiline's previous wife in Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.14 (quoted above) hints at foul play. S.'s story about the murder of the step-son is accepted by Appian, *BC* 2.2. Val. Max. 9.1.9 is even more explicit: *veneno sustulit.* S.'s use of *necato* suggests that the manner of death could have been of the type stated by Val. Max. Cf. Festus (159L): *neci datus proprie dicitur qui sine vulnere interfectus est, ut veneno aut fame.*

15.3-5. **quae quidem res . . . vecordia inerat:** Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 562f., remarks on S.'s introduction of the tragic Ἄτη as an example of the emotive technique of Hellenistic history-writing. Cf. P. Scheller, *De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte,* Diss. Leipzig, 1911, 57ff.; Diodorus, 14.23.5. The concept of *conscientia scelerum* is referred to several times: 5.7, 14.3, 35.2, cf. *Hist.* 1.77.7M *scelerum conscientia exagitati.* A passage in *Ep. ad Caes.* (2.12.6-8) is also of interest; Caesar is warned of the torment of conscience: *profecto si quid accidat, neque tibi nox neque dies curam animi sedaverit, quin insomniis exercitus, furibundus atque amens alienata mente feraris.* The concept of madness brought about by *conscientia scelerum* derives from tragedy (Skard, *SO* Suppl. 11 (1943) 141ff.) and as a traditional motif it made its way into historiography. Its origin in tragedy is indicated by Virgil's use of the motif, *Aen.* 3.331, 4.9. Livy's use of it in 1.47.7-8 suggests its persistence in history-writing.

On the Roman concept of *conscientia* see F. Zucker, *Syneidesis-conscientia,* Jena, 1928; M. Pohlenz, *Stoa,* 1.317, 11.158; O. Seel, *Festschrift Dornseiff,* Leipzig, 1953; G. Rudberg, *SO* 31 (1955) 96ff.

15.3. **quae quidem res:** the effect of murder committed is to render Catiline not a little mad. S. takes this as a chief motive for hastening the conspiracy. This, the "private" aspect of the

conspiracy—a desperate attempt by the corrupt and disaffected under a mad leader, 16.1-3, 24.2, 28.4—comprises the *sceleris novitas* of S.'s theme. It assumes dangerous significance and acquires the dimension of *periculi novitas* when it is combined with the chaotic political situation of the period, an element treated in greater detail in chs. 37-9.

facinus maturandi: only P has preserved this, the genuine reading; all other MSS have trivialised to *facinoris maturandi.*

15.4. **infestus:** S. uses this word often, e.g. 19.1, 52.29, and always in the primary and far more common active sense—"hostile to". The closeness of the description here with that of Jugurtha in *BJ* 72.2 is very marked.

neque vigiliis neque quietibus: cf. *BJ* 72.2 *neque . . . dies aut nox ulla quieta fuit*; Livy, 1.47.1. On the use of the plural *quietibus* and the polar expression see Introd. p. 16, and 5.3 n. *patiens.*

ita conscientia: explanatory *ita* is frequent in earlier Latin, e.g. Plautus, *Rud.* 903. Cf. *BJ* 72.2, 74.1, 99.3. See L-H-S, 514. The use of epiphonema (7.5) is very similar.

Such quasi-personified abstract subjects as *conscientia* here are commonplace in historians; Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax*, 2nd ed. Berlin, 1872, gives many examples from Livy. There is a close parallel of the thought and expression of this passage in *Rhet. ad Her.* 2.8.

vastabat: this is quite a remarkable use of *vastare* ("torment"); see 5.5 n. *vastus animus* where the idea of "enormity" is also present. The more usual *exagitari* might have been expected but for the preceding *excitam.* Cf. *BJ* 72.2 *ita formidine quasi vecordia exagitari*; since *vecordia* is definitely attributed to Catiline, this may account for S.'s choice of *vastabat* here. For a very similar description, but one expressed in very different style, see Seneca's picture of Caligula, *de Const. Sap.* 18.1.

15.5. **igitur colos exanguis . . . vecordia inerat:** more appropriate than the alternative readings *color ei ex(s)anguis*; *color eius ex(s)anguis.* The exclusion of unimportant words like *ei, eius* recommends itself on the grounds that the power of S.'s description lies in the chiastic accumulation of nouns, stripped of all that is unnecessary, to convey the physical features which are finally summed up in a favourite Sallustian doublet expression—*facie voltuque* (Introd. p. 15).

colos: this is the only place where this word occurs in the nominative singular. The same applies to *odor* in *BJ* 44.4. In both places the MSS have without exception *color* and *odor*. Probus quotes this passage with *colos*, 4.15.14, 4.23.34K and Fronto (109-110N) quotes the other with *odos*. Kurfess reads *odor* at *BJ* 44.4 and it is hard to explain his acceptance of the grammarian's reading here and his rejection of similar evidence in the other passage. Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.253, says that S. writes *labos 'paene ubique'*. The word occurs four times: *BC* 7.5, *BJ* 100.4 where *labor* is the MSS reading, and *Hist.* 2.47.1M, 3.48.18M, both times in speeches, where the only MS (V) reads *labos*. *Colos, lepos* (25.5) etc. can be described as archaisms.

foedi oculi: Servius, *ad Aen.* 2.55, and Donatus, *Aen.* 4.195 quote this passage to support their claim that *foedus* is equivalent to *crudelis*. *Foedus* should be taken here in its more usual sense of *atrox, terribilis* (*Thes. LL.* 6.999).

citus modo, modo tardus incessus etc.: cf. Cicero, *pro Sest.* 17 *vultum atque incessum animis intuemini, facilius eorum facta occurrent mentibus vestris si ora ipsa oculis proposueritis*; *Off.* 1.131; Seneca, *Herc. Fur.* 330.

prorsus: see on *prorsus*, 16.5.

in facie inerat: S. elsewhere, e.g. 17.2, 23.2, uses *inerat* with a dative expressed and this may account for the presence of *ei* in some MSS. But see 25.5 where the dative is also understood and note intrusive *ei, eius* discussed above.

16.1-3. **sed iuventutem . . . malus atque crudelis erat:** having shown that by inclination and practice Catiline is eminently fitted to head the *perdita iuventus* which forms the stable nucleus (17,6) of his support, S. goes on to show how Catiline uses his knowledge of this element in Roman society to fashion a tool suitable for the achievement of his personal goal.

In his delineation of character he continues to draw upon a traditional store of concept and phraseology. Thus *animus audax* of 5.4 is used also by Livy in 33.33.8 and S.'s *animus ferox* (e.g. 5.7, 38.1) is especially common in Livy's first decade. Similarly the concept of *gratuita crudelitas* is met with in Livy's narrative of Tarquinius, 1.47.1 and of the *decemviri*, 3.37.8.

16.1. **inlexerat:** cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.8; Livy's *allicere donis iuvenes*, 1.47.7.

16.2. **ex illis testis signatoresque falsos commodare:** *ex*

8

illis refers by synesis to *iuventutem*, as, e.g. *familia* . . . *quorum* of *BJ* 14.6 and *senatus* . . . *iique* of *BJ* 28.2; it is a change of number which is by no means unique to S. (cf. Kühner-Stegmann, I.29; L-H-S 438) but is part of the general *inconcinnitas* of S.'s style. On *testes* see Livy, 39.8.7. *Signatores* were people who attested wills with their seals (cf. Suetonius, *Tib.* 23) and the term is used also of witnesses to marriage rites (Juvenal, 10.336, cf. 1.67). *Commodare*, with the meaning *aptare*, to furnish, (*Thes. LL.* 3.1920. 46ff.) and sometimes carrying the idea of getting something in return, is the appropriate word here. Cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 2.11.23 *operam suam* . . . *ad turpissimum ministerium commodasse.*

fidem fortunas pericula vilia habere: note the asyndeton; *habere* is to be taken as historic infinitive, paralleling the preceding *commodare*, and the phrase rendered "he regarded their good faith etc. as things of little value". For the change from historic infins. to the imperf. tense (*imperabat*) see Introd. p. 20. In this case *post* makes a break in the narrative.

16.3. **si . . . minus suppetebat:** *minus* used for *non*, a colloquial usage with ironic undertones. See L-H-S, 454; Wackernagel, 2.255.

insontis sicuti sontis: *insontis*, a transferred moral notion, is best rendered "not in the way of his plans". As elsewhere (see on 28.1) *sicuti* could have a meaning equivalent to *quasi*, "as if they were". It could also carry the meaning of *et* . . . *et* forming a polar expression of indiscriminate killing; he had people killed whether they were of interest to him or not.

circumvenire iugulare: historic infinitives rather than objects of *imperabat*, expanding *maiora alia*.

gratuito: "for nothing", "wantonly". Cf. Livy, 3.37.8 *gratuita crudelitas*; Seneca, *Ep.* 105.4. For the sentiment in general cf. Cicero, *Off.* 2.84 *peccare etiam si causa non esset*; Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.9M.

16.4-5. **His amicis sociisque . . . opportuna Catilinae:** here, almost casually, S. introduces factors which had an important bearing on the decision to form a conspiracy. He goes beyond the moral aspect and mentions conditions, both social and economic, which go far towards accounting for Catiline's success in acquiring and retaining a devoted following. In customary Sallustian fashion we have here a summary or generalisation, the details of which will receive a fuller treatment at appropriate points in the narrative. Thus the question of debt reappears significantly in ch. 33 and in the analysis of the urban proletariate

in ch. 37. Similarly the support provided by *Sullani milites* is a constant factor, and the significance of the absence of Pompeius is more fully explained in ch. 39.

16.4. **confisus ... simul quod ... et quod:** for the parataxis achieved by a change of construction see Introd. p. 15. See also on 40.1. It is a form of *inconcinnitas* which occurs in other writers. Compare Thucydides' use of a clause and a present participle, e.g. 1.1 he chooses the Peloponnesian as the greatest war ὅτι ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν . . . καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ὁρῶν ξυνιστάμενον πρὸς ἑκατέρους. Cf. also Caesar, *BC* 1.27.2; Livy, 1.4.2 (*seu ita rata seu quia*), 6.12.1. See L-H-S, 817.

aes alienum: a condition endemic in the Roman state. See notes to ch. 33. For the earlier Republic cf. Livy, 6.35.1 *occasio videbatur rerum novandarum propter ingentem vim aeris alieni* etc.

Sullani milites ... exoptabant: see notes on 5.6, 11.5-6. Cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.20 *in tantum aes alienum inciderunt ut, si salvi esse velint, Sulla sit iis ab inferis excitandus.*

16.5. **in Italia nullus exercitus:** there were very probably troops in Cisalpina. From 67 to 65 the Gauls were combined under C. Piso, consul 67; the presence of four legions divided among the two provinces is certain for 63. From 30.5, 57.2, 58.6 we learn that Q. Metellus Celer was placed in charge of the Ager Picenus and Gallicus and Cisalpina; we also know that he had under his command *Gallicanae legiones* (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.5). Of his three legions at least two must have been moved from Cisalpina. See Broughton, *MRR* 2.166-000; P. A. Brunt; *Italian Manpower*, Oxford, 1971, 465.

in extremis terris: Pontus and Armenia, where Pompeius was pursuing the war against Mithridates. *Extremae terrae* was the type of term used to indicate regions far removed and little known to the average Roman; cf. Nepos, *Att.* 20.4; Virgil, *Geo.* 2.171; Livy, *Epit.* 101; Lucan, 4.1; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.82.1.

consulatum petenti: the participle here because Catiline was already a candidate for the consulship of 63 (cf. 21.3); *petendi* of many codices is a gloss, the scribes expecting a genitive with *spes.*

tutae tranquillaeque res omnes: in comparison with the turmoil of 66 (ch. 18) and the overt activity of Crassus in 65 (see on 19.1) the year 64 opened quietly. But it was a delusive calm; cf. 23.5 on the reported activities of Caesar and Crassus before the elections.

ea: *constructio ad sensum* (Introd. p. 16).

prorsus: the only place in S. where it is used in the sense of *omnino*; elsewhere (e.g. 15.5, 25.5) it has the meaning "in a word".

Ch. 17: *The first meeting of the conspirators*

17.1. **Igitur circiter Kalendas . . . consulibus:** this meeting of the adherents of Catiline and the report of the programme of the conspiracy in chs. 20-22 are clearly anachronisms—see Appendix III.

On artistic grounds (Introd. p. 12f.) S. is being consistent in that he has already viewed Catiline as a typical product of the post-Sullan environment. To accept that Catiline the revolutionary emerged simply as the result of an electoral defeat would not be sufficient to prove the evolution of Catiline as a product of his period. Moreover the composition of his following at this point—he is not yet the champion of the lower classes—and the repeated reference to the fact that success was felt to depend on success at the elections make for the assumption that S. is here dealing not with a fully-fledged conspiracy but with an exploratory and preparatory programme on the part of Catiline.

L. Caesare et C. Figulo consulibus: i.e. 64 B.C. Lucius Julius Caesar was brother to the Julia who married first M. Antonius Creticus to whom she bore Antonius the triumvir. She afterwards married Lentulus the conspirator. Cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.13; *Fam.* 10.28.3. See *RE* X.468(143). C. Marcius Figulus was called Minucius Thermus before his adoption into the family of the Marcii. Cf. Cicero, *Leg.* 2.62, *Att.* 1.1.2. See *RE* XIV.1559(63).

appellare . . . hortari . . . temptare . . . docere: a typically Sallustian succession of four historic infinitives with the second and third connected by chiasmus (Introd. p. 19). On *circiter Kal. Junias . . . appellare* Constans notes that we have here the only example of historic infin. connected with a statement of time. However *circiter* makes it a little indefinite.

opes suas . . . inparatam r.p . . . . magna praemia: note the deliberate lack of concinnity.

17.2. **ubi satis explorata sunt quae voluit:** on S.'s liking for passive phrasing both for *variatio* and for its air of archaism see Introd. p. 19.

quae voluit: *voluit*, perfect aorist for *volebat*, attracted into the perfect by *explorata sunt. Voluit* instead of *vellet* also points to

the fact of his plans in an absolute sense. The same factors would apply if S. wrote *volvit* ("intended") here, a possibility which should not be overlooked. The meaning would fit the context, and the verb occurs elsewhere in S. in forms not so readily susceptible to corruption: thus *BJ* 6.2 (*volvebat*), *BJ* 108.3 (*volvere*), *BC* 32.1, *BJ* 113.1 (*volvens*).

in unum: used adverbially; no need to supply *locum*. Cf. *BJ* 11.2, 50.5, 51.3, 98.4; Livy, 36.8.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.47, 1, 15.26.2.

necessitudo: more normally used to signify the ties of kinship. In S. it is most often used for *necessitas*, a word which does not occur in *Bell. Cat.* or in *Bell. Jug.*; cf. Gellius, 13.3.3. The distinction between the words seems to have been fully established by S.'s time, but, as with *claritudo* (*BJ* 2.4, 7.4) for *claritas*, he prefers the older *-udo* forms in his earlier works. In his last work, the *Histories*, *necessitas* occurs twice in its normal meaning (1.55.15, 2.98.8M) as does the more contemporary form *sanctitas* (5.3M). See Goodyear on Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.9.3.

inerat: properly goes only with *plurumum audaciae*, and by the figure zeugma supplies the verb for *necessitudo*.

17.3. **eo convenere:** a feature of S.'s listing of the conspirators is his notable brevity. He says little beyond their names and makes no attempt to use other available material for the purpose of sharp or colourful criticism. On the use of copulae in this listing see Introd. p. 15f.

P. Lentulus Sura: of the house of the Cornelii. Praetor in 75, consul in 71. Expelled, along with C. Antonius, Cicero's colleague in the consulship of 63, from the Senate by the censors in 70. To obtain re-admission to the Senate he stood for and won the praetorship of 63. A leading conspirator, he was executed for his crime. Cicero speaks of his *dicendi exercitatio* in *in Cat.* 3.11 but gives a less flattering picture in *Brut.* 235, and speaks derisively of *P. Lentuli somnum* in *in Cat.* 3.16. See *RE* IV.1399(240).

P. Autronius Paetus: elected consul for 65 but unseated for bribery. Much more vivid detail is given by Cicero, *pro Sulla* 71, cf. *Brut.* 241. From Cicero (*Sulla* 10) we gather that he was with others of the conspirators later convicted under the *lex Plautia de vi* and suffered sentence of banishment. See *RE* 11.2612(7). J. Linderski, *Historia* 12 (1963) 512 n. 10, argues aginst the senatorial status granted here to Paetus and to P. Cornelius Sulla.

L. Cassius Longinus: praetor with Cicero in 66 and an un-

successful candidate for the consulship of 63. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.16 derides *P. Cassi adipes* and states that Cassius demanded supervision of arson as his specific revolutionary role (*ibid.* 14); cf. Asconius 82C. He was later banished under the *lex Plautia.* See *RE* III.1738(64).

C. Cethegus: belonged, like Lentulus, to the Cornelii. Played a leading part. Even in S.'s brief treatment he stands out as a forceful and colourful personality. Later executed. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.16 speaks of his *furiosam temeritatem* and intimates in *pro Sulla* 70 that he vied with Catiline in rashness and audacity; cf. Lucan, 2.543, 6.794. See *RE* IV.1278(89).

P. et Ser. Sullae, Ser. filii: Publius Cornelius Sulla and Servius Cornelius Sulla, sons of Servius, the brother of the dictator. It is clear from Cicero's *pro Sulla* 6 that the Publius Sulla listed here is not to be confused with the Publius Sulla who was deprived of the consulship of 65 (ch. 18) on a bribery charge brought by Torquatus and who, accused by the same Torquatus of complicity in the conspiracy, was successfully defended by Cicero on this charge in 62; Cicero's speech *pro Sulla* reports this trial. The relationship between these two Publii Sullae is not clear. Cicero calls the Sulla of his defence speech *propinquus* of the dictator (*Off.* 2.29) and it is likely that the two were cousins. Both brothers were convicted and banished under the *lex Plautia.* On Publius see *RE* IV.1518 (385); on Servius *RE* IV.1521 (389). To put the name common to the two in the plural *(Sullae)* is also Cicero's practice; but S. also has *Ti. et C. Gracchus* in *BJ* 42.1.

L. Vargunteius: his conviction and banishment under the *lex Plautia* is reported by Cicero, *pro Sulla* 6. Cicero also implies (*ibid.* 67) that V. was implicated in the disturbances of 66, but this may be part of his special pleading for his client. Linderski, *op. cit.* also disputes the senatorial status granted to V. here on the grounds of a probable indictment under the *lex Calpurnia de ambitu* in 66.

Q. Annius: presumably the Q. Annius Chilo of Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.14 where he is accused of tampering with the Allobroges. See *RE* I.2263(18).

M. Porcius Laeca: of the same *gens* as the Catos. Chiefly remembered for the fact that it was at his house that the crucial meeting of the conspirators took place—27.3; Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.8. Condemned and banished under the *lex Plautia* (Cicero, *pro Sulla* 6). See *RE* XXII.213(18).

L. **Bestia:** Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, tribune of the plebs in 62. Present in the camp of Antonius before Mutina (Cicero, *Phil.* 11.11, 13.26). He is identified with the Bestia defended on a bribery charge by Cicero in 56 (*Q.fr.* 2.3.6, *pro Cael.* 7, *Phil.* 13.26) although this identification is doubted or denied (F. Münzer, *RE* III.1367 (24-25)). R. G. Austin in his *pro Caelio* (3rd ed. 1960, 154ff.) argues strongly in favour of the identification and this is conceded by Broughton, *MRR* Suppl. (1960). Plutarch, *Cic.* 23.1 names Bestia as the colleague of Metellus Nepos in the harassment of Cicero in the last days of his consulship by protesting against the execution of Roman citizens. Cicero, *pro Sulla* 31 (cf. *pro Sest.* 11) alludes to a tribune who deplored the fate of the conspirators, and *Schol. Bob.* identify this tribune as very probably Bestia (82 St.). See *RE* III.1367(24-25) and on 43.1.

Q. Curius: the major figure in ch. 23. Cicero's chief source of information. A descendant of the same house which had produced Manius Curius Dentatus, consul in 290, the famous opponent of Pyrrhus. Suetonius, *Caes.* 17.1 reports on rewards due to Curius for information given. See *RE* IV.1840(7).

17.4. **M. Fulvius Nobilior:** not mentioned again by S. nor does he figure in any other account of the conspiracy. This fact of itself is not sufficient grounds for expunging the name from the text, though its presence has worried some commentators. Wirz assumes the name got into the next from a corrupted gloss, *Fulvius nobilis*, taken from *Fulvius, senatoris filius*, whose execution is reported at 39.5. It is a striking coincidence indeed that expansion of a corrupted insertion should produce a name independently attested for this period: Cicero, *Att.* 4.18.3 (see Shackleton Bailey's note) speaks of a M. Fulvius Nobilior in 54. See *RE* VII.267(94).

L. Statilius: noted at 43.2 as in charge of the arson squad, and at 55.6 as among the executed. See *RE* IIIA.2185(6).

P. Gabinius Capito: mentioned among the executed at 55.6 and in connection with the Allobroges at 40.6. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.6 gives him the cognomen Cimber and calls him *omnium scelerum improbissimus machinator.* On the possible importance of both A. Gabinius and this conspirator as links with the absent Pompeius see E. Badian, *Ph.* 103 (1959) 87ff. See *RE* VII.431(15).

C. Cornelius: member of the plebeian branch of the *gens Cornelia.* Undertook with Vargunteius to murder Cicero (28.1). Later convicted under the *lex Plautia* (Cicero, *pro Sulla* 6). See

RE IV.1255(19). He is not to be confused with C. Cornelius, tribune of 67 (Asconius 57C; Cassius Dio, 36.38.4ff.).

ex coloniis et municipiis: i.e. the towns of Italy. *Coloniae* (Gellius, 16.13) were at first garrisons of citizens or Latin allies permanently quartered on lands captured from the enemy or at places of strategic importance. *Municipium* seems originally to have been the name for a community of Italians with civil rights but not the political privileges of Roman citizens. Gradually all towns of this class became Roman boroughs; their freemen enjoyed full Roman citizenship and still retained large rights of local self-government. Festus (155L) gives various definitions which indicate different stages of transition. On *coloniae* see *RE* IV.511; on *municipia, RE* XVI.570.

domi nobiles: members of local aristocracies of Italy, many with considerable influence at Rome both as members of the *comitia centuriata* and because of personal ties with Roman politicians. Some or all of the *municipes* mentioned in connection with the conspiracy, e.g. Septimius the Camertine (27.1), M. Caeparius of Terracina (46.3-4, 47.1; Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.14), T. Volturcius from Croton (44.3, 45.3-4, 47.1; Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.4, 3.8, 4.5; Florus, 2.12.9; Appian, *BC* 2.4) may have been members of this class. See T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate*, Oxford, 1971, 36ff., 115f., 136ff.

17.5. **erant praeterea complures . . . aut alia necessitudo:** the element of powerful figures behind the scenes who sympathised with the aims of the conspiracy and who hoped to manipulate the ensuing disorder to their own purposes is mentioned again at 39.4, 48.4, 49.1. This factor is discussed under 39.4.

17.6. **ceterum iuventus pleraque:** Cicero uses only the plural of *plerusque*. S. uses both sing. (23.6, 38.2) and plur. forms (3.2 *et al.*). S.'s use of *plerusque* which occurs also in Cato, 4.15, 9.12J; Valerius Antias (*HRR* fr. 21) and Varro, *LL* 9.68, and later in Gellius, e.g. 17.21.12, and Apuleius should be considered one of his archaisms. On *ceterum* see on 20.6.

maxume nobilium: the repetition of *nobilis*, *nobilitas* in references to Catiline and his followers (e.g. 5.1, 18.4, 23.3, 43.2, 52.24) reflects S.'s view that the troubles of which the conspiracy was a symptom were in part due to the corrupt and unpatriotic attitude of members of this class.

vivere copia erat: *vivere* for the more classical *vivendi*. Kritz

defends the infinitive as depending on the verbal notion in *copia est* = *potest.* Note the use of *copiam dare* + infin. in Virgil and Catullus; it is very usual for combinations of noun and auxiliary to acquire the construction of a synonymous verb. For the meaning of *copia* here cf. on 8.5.

favebat . . . quibus . . . malebant: could be taken as a variation in the number of the verb in connection with a collective noun (Introd. p. 16). It seems better to assume that with *quibus* S. is dealing with the individuals of a specific section within his major group. See on 7.4.

incerta pro certis . . . malebant: almost a proverb. Cf. 20.2 *incerta pro certis captarem*; *BJ* 83.1 *non debere incerta pro certis mutare*; Livy, 39.54.7 *certam pacem quam incerta belli praeoptantes*; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.86.7 *pro certis et olim partis nova ambigua ancipitia malebat*; Seneca, *Suas.* 1.10. See A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter der Römer*, Hildesheim, 1890, 81.

bellum quam pacem malebant: cf. Xenophon, *Anab.* 2.6.6 for the idea that war is sought without any compelling reason. For *malle* with an accus. object cf. *BJ* 24.2, 70.5, 81.4, 102.5. It is a construction which is not common in Cicero and is lacking in Caesar. Earlier, it appears in Plautus, *Cist.* 33, *Curc.* 320, *Poen.* 1214.

17.7. **fuere item . . . principem se fore:** the suspicions against Crassus and S.'s handling of this feature are discussed under 19.1.

quia Cn. Pompeius: connected causally with what precedes, but, as often with S., e.g. 7.5 *virtus omnia domuerat*, 39.4 *neque illis* etc., 43.4 *natura ferox* etc., 52.4 *capta urbe* etc., the causal conjunction is omitted, *quia* being subordinated to a clause which follows.

invisus ipsi: the well-known friction between Pompeius and Crassus in the year of their joint consulship (70 B.C.)—Suetonius, *Jul.* 19.2; cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 4.51M; Plutarch, *Crass.* 12.2-4, *Pomp.* 23.1-2)—could have begun as early as 80, the occasion of Pompeius' triumph for his African campaign (Plutarch, *Crass.* 7.1); it persisted throughout their careers, even when they joined forces for their mutual benefit (e.g. Cicero, *Att.* 1.14.2-3, 2.21.3-4, *Q. Fr.* 2.3.2-4) and Crassus' motive for departing with his family for Asia in 62 is accurately interpreted by Plutarch (*Pomp.* 43.1) as a desire to lend credence to anti-Pompeian gossip. See E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley, 1974, 84 n. 5.

ductabat: "was in fact in command of".

magnum exercitum: the bill of Manilius in 66 had made Pompeius general extraordinary in the provinces of Asia, Cilicia and Bithynia, vested with almost unlimited military and financial powers to finish the war against Mithridates.

simul confisum: see on 19.2 n. *simul.*

apud illos: by synesis referring to *coniuratio.*

Chs. 18-19: *Digression—The First Catilinarian Conspiracy*

18.1. **sed antea . . . in quis Catilina fuit:** introduces a digression which is puzzling in character. Abruptly introduced by *sed antea,* it is not well placed, separating as it does the description of the assembly of the conspirators (ch. 17) and the speech they were to hear from Catiline (ch. 20). It gives the impression of being almost an afterthought. As such, it could have been suggested by the mention of Crassus as among the sympathisers of the conspiracy, motivated partly by his hostility to Pompeius (17.7). This line of thought might then have evoked the relationship between Crassus and Piso (19.1), a decided enemy of Pompeius. To explain Piso S. expounds the "first conspiracy" in which Piso is alleged to have played an important part. Such an explanation deprives the digression of the significance with which it has been invested by modern commentators, and restricts it to an exercise of annotation with no structural function in the monograph. Cf. Syme, 100. For a brief account of the nature and quality of reports of this alleged conspiracy see Appendix IV.

In S.'s account of this episode there are hints at the unsatisfactory state of the evidence available to him—*quam verissume potero* (18.2); *sunt qui . . . dicant . . . alii autem* (19.4)—but he sets out to give as definitive a version as possible of a story which has been marked by variations since its first appearance. It may be that S.'s aim was to refute the charges made by Bibulus and Scribonius Curio in 59 against Crassus and Caesar (Suetonius, *Caes.* 9). Whatever his reason he takes over from Cicero a flimsy structure of allegations against Catiline; this is unfortunate because of the subsequent influence of the Sallustian version on modern historical research (Appendix IV).

That S. chose to accept the story of the "first conspiracy" instead of discarding it or throwing serious doubts on its accuracy may be accounted for on artistic grounds (Introd. p. 12f.). He has already shown Catiline as a revolutionary in heart and intention

from the time of the Sullan domination (5.6). This essay at revolution in 66 would thus be entirely in keeping with his view of his principal character; conversely, the monographic treatment of a range of activity would not allow, in the interests of strict accuracy, the suppression of a suspected similar undertaking on the part of the central figure of the monograph. On the probable influence of Thucydides see introd. p. 13.

in quis: *quis* for *quibus* occurs fourteen times in *Bell. Jug.* and is also present in the *Histories*. All codices agree in reading *in quibus* here and decisions to abandon this reading are not well founded; thus Jordan (text) and Ahlberg (*Prolegomena*) rely on the authority of Diomedes (1.445.23K) and Kurfess is influenced by the research of R. Zimmermann, *Der Sallusttext im Altertum*, 1929, 30f. The only examples of *quis* in this monograph are doubtful; thus 31.1 is based on Fronto (v.d.H 105); cf. G. Perl, *F &F* 33, 2 (1959) 56.

18.2. **de qua:** commonly explained as *constructio ad sensum, coniuratione* to be supplied from the preceding verb *coniuravere.* It is a type of construction accepted for S. on the basis of its frequent occurrence in Thucydides, e.g. 7.28.2 where φυλακήν has to be supplied from φυλάσσοντες. But no exactly similar example is to be found in Latin. Löfstedt, 2.146 refers to Schmalz's parallel aus Bismarcks Briefen Nr. 168, S. 264 and can point only to Cicero, *Leg.* 2.63 *permansit hoc ius terra humandi; quam quom proxumi* etc., relying on Vahlen's interpretation *quam* = *humationem,* and dismissing the misgivings of Turnebus and C. F. W. Müller. Kühner-Stegmann, 1.30 can quote only Hyginus 194 (124, 23): *quos* = *nautas* from preceding *navem.* L-H-S 441 add Chiron 285, *ambulet . . . ex hac* (= *ambulatione*) and Cassiodorus, *Hist.* 10.8.3: *Innocentius . . . scripsit . . . quod . . . quas* (= *epistulas*). McCartney, *CPh* 18 (1923) 294 quotes Nepos, *Hann.* 8.4: *conflixit* (= *proelium commisit*). *In quo* etc., a disputed text. Löfstedt sums up the value of such parallels: "die einzigen wirklichen Analogien aus der grossen Literatur, die ich kenne, sind die beiden oben (aus Sallust und Bismarcks Briefen) angeführten". The above facts should compel us to consider the possibility of corruption in S.'s text. The suggestion (Kritz) that *re* may have dropped out if S. wrote *de qua* <*re*> *quam verissume* is an attractive one.

quam verissume: reluctantly retained by Kurfess; in his *app. crit.* he notes as *'fortasse recte'* Diomedes' reading *brevissime*

(1.445.23K) and on p. 198 defends it on the remarkably naive grounds that since S.'s chronology is wrong he could not have written *verissume*, which probably intruded from 4.3. The seriously corrupt text of Diomedes (R. Marache, *Rev. d. ét. anc.* 58, 1956, 162) is a poor guide. *Verissume* may signify an intention to correct other distorted versions (Earl, *Hermes* 91 (1963) 126f.) but it need mean no more than a recognition by S. of the corrupt state of his sources and the expression of a desire to do the best he can in the circumstances.

L. Tullo et M'. Lepido consulibus: i.e. 66 B.C. L. Volcacius Tullus was the consul who refused Catiline's candidature for election in 66 (Asconius, 89C).

P. Autronius: see under 17.3.

P. Sulla: not to be confused with the P. Sulla of 17.3. Condemned on a charge of *ambitus* in 66, he was indicted in 62 under the *lex Plautia de vi* by L. Manlius Torquatus, son of the consul for 65, on a charge of complicity in the Catilinarian conspiracy. Cicero (*pro Sulla*) successfully defended. Sulla was married to Pompeius' sister Pompeia (*ad Q. fr.* 3.3.2, cf. Münzer, *RE* XV.616), which may throw some light on his candidature for 65. He took part in the civil war on Caesar's side and was therefore accused by Cicero of profiteering both under his kinsman Sulla and under Caesar (*Off.* 2.29, but cf. *pro Sulla* 72). His death at the end of 46 caused Cicero little concern (*Fam.* 15.17.2). His son by Pompeia left no trace in history. See further *RE* IV.1518(386).

designati consules: on inversion of the normal order, *consules designati* (*Thes. LL.* 5.720), see Introd. p. 16. Here the order may have been chosen to avoid the unpleasant jingle *designati . . . interrogati*.

legibus ambitus interrogati: the charge, according to Cicero, *Fin.* 2.62 was brought by Cotta and the son of Torquatus, the same man who later prosecuted in Cicero's *pro Sulla*. Asconius, 75C and Cassius Dio, 36.44.3 state, probably correctly, that it was Torquatus the elder. Cf. Drumann-Groebe, 5.420.

Leges ambitus were laws passed to put down corrupt practices, bribery in particular, at elections. The technical name appears as early as 358 B.C. in the *lex Poetelia de ambitu* (Livy, 7.15.12-13). The law applied in this case was probably the *lex Calpurnia* (*Acilia Calpurnia*) of 67; this law was confirmed and strengthened by the *lex Tullia* of Cicero in 63 (*pro Mur.* 46,67). Such laws in this period

may form part of the Optimate attempt to retain control of the machinery of government in anticipation of Pompeius' return from the east. On *leges ambitus* see Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 865ff.; L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, Berkeley, 1949, 67ff.

The *interrogatio* was an early stage of a criminal trial. After a *nominis delatio* by the prosecutor and an *inscriptio* on the formal list of a magistrate, the accused (*reus*) was required to appear before the praetor and answer the question as to his guilt, a question put according to the technical forms prescribed by the special law under which he was being prosecuted. Hence the word *interrogatio* is commonly coupled, as here (*legibus ambitus*), with a definite law—cf. 31.4 *lege Plautia*. In later Latin, as in Tacitus, e.g. *Ann.* 14.46.1, 16.21.3, *lege* etc. is sometimes omitted. For the course of a Roman trial see Greenidge, 456ff.

poenas dederant: the prosecution was successful despite an attempt to interrupt proceedings, by Autronius according to Cicero, *pro Sulla* 15. The penalty included forfeiture of the consulship and of their social and political standing, in that they lost their seats in the Senate and could not in the future hold any public office. Cf. Cassius Dio, 36.38.1, 37.25.3, *Schol. Bob.* 78-9 St.

18.3. **post paulo Catilina . . . nequiverat:** the other major source for Catiline's attempted candidature for the consulship of 65 is Asconius (89C) who states: *Professus deinde est Catilina petere se consulatum. L. Volcacius Tullus consul consilium publicum habuit an rationem Catilinae habere deberet, si peteret consulatum: nam quaerebatur repetundarum. Catilina ob eam causam destitit a petitione.* The difference between the sources has raised two basic questions which are still matters of dispute: viz. (a) from which election was Catiline debarred? (b) on what grounds was he prevented from standing as candidate?

post paulo: clearly implies that S. is referring to the supplementary election in 66 in which Autronius and Sulla were replaced by L. Manlius Torquatus and L. Aurelius Cotta. Of the more recent treatments of this topic those of Syme (88, 91, 100), M. Mello, *Parola del Passato* 18 (1963) 36ff., Earl, *Historia* 14 (1965) 327f. follow C. John, *Rh. Mus.* 31 (1876) 401ff. in holding that S. was wrong and that Catiline was debarred from the first election in 66 probably held, as was usual, in July. R. Seager, *Historia* 13 (1964) 338ff. and G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 19 (1965) 226ff. follow

E. G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context,* = *JRS* 7 (1917) 157ff. in accepting the implication of S.'s account—Catiline's blocked candidature was for the supplementary election, held after the trial of Sulla and Autronius and before *Nonas Decembris* (18.5). Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 1.503 n. 1 cited Cicero, *pro Cael.* 10 (*Secutus est tum annus, causam de pecuniis repetundis Catilina dixit*) for the fact that Catiline's trial did not come on till 65 and held, wrongly, that the consuls of 66 intimated that he could not stand till the trial was over, hence debarring him from candidature in 65 also. For reasons given below I believe that S. was correct in intimating that the candidature was for the supplementary election of 66.

pecuniarum repetundarum reus: the *crimen repetundarum pecuniarum* included among other things the offence committed by a Roman provincial governor in getting money or other valuables by illegal means from the subjects and *socii* of Rome. The direct object of the prosecution was the recovery of the money taken, hence the term *repetundae* (*res repetere*). The term was also used to describe the illegal act for which compensation was sought. The *lex Porcia,* probably proposed by M. Porcius Cato about 198 B.C., was the first legislative act on the abuse of powers by provincial governors. A permanent court for such offences was established by the *lex Calpurnia* of 149 B.C. The *lex Cornelia,* based upon an earlier *lex Servilia,* was enacted during the dictatorship of Sulla. See further Mommsen, *Strafrecht,* 705ff., *id., Ges. Schr.* 1.1-64; Greenidge, 433ff.; Strachan Davidson, *Problems* 2.75ff.

Catiline as propraetor in Africa managed his province in such a way that complaints were received against him in Rome even prior to his return to the capital in 66. Cf. Cicero, *Tog. Cand.* apud Asc. 85-7, 89C.

prohibitus erat consulatum petere: according to Asconius the consul L. Volcacius Tullus held a *consilium publicum*—consultation with leading men in the state—as to whether he should admit Catiline's candidature since he was to be prosecuted for extortion. The first implication of this is that Volcacius seems to be able to act against Catiline only by virtue of the powers inherent in his consular *imperium,* and he sets about this only after consulting a *consilium* in the traditional way. The second implication is that the threat of prosecution did not constitute a technical disqualification, otherwise there would have been no need to

hold a *consilium*. Asconius, in effect, gives no reason for the disqualification; moreover, his statement, as it stands, could apply to either of the elections in 66. S., aware of this account, describes Catiline as *pecuniarum repetundarum reus*. If this is to be interpreted as a ground for disqualification it must also be rejected. We know that the trial did not take place until about July 65 (Asconius 85C; Cicero, *Att.* 1.2.1, *pro Sulla* 81, *pro Cael.* 10); even if preliminary proceedings were set in train as soon as Catiline returned to Rome he could not be disqualified as *reus* until the *nominis delatio* and the *sortitio iudicum* (Hardy, *op. cit.*). A similar case arose in the person of Scaurus in 54. He returned from Sardinia *ad consulatus petitionem* on June 28; he was *postulatus repetundarum* on July 6, yet he did not thereby become disqualified from candidature (Asconius 18ff.C). This, therefore, does not constitute an adequate legal cause for questioning Catiline's candidature. Volcacius thus probably held his *consilium* because there was no clear precedent in the case of an impending prosecution.

quod intra legitumos dies profiteri nequiverat: the phrase *legitumi dies* has been much discussed, e.g. Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, Hardy, *op. cit.* 10 n. 1 = 159 n. 1. It is simpler here to take it as a reference to *trinum nundinum*, commonly interpreted as an interval of twenty-four days between the announcement of a date for the *comitia* and the election day; see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 3.375; Kroll in *RE* XVII.1467ff.; W. Kubitschek, *Grundriss der Antiken Zeitrechnung*, 1927, 38, 40, 134; Ogilvie on Livy, 3.35.1; A. W. Lintott, *CQ* ns16 (1965) 281ff.; A. K. Michels, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic*, Princeton, 1967, App. 3. As such, S.'s statement does constitute a legal ground for the refusal of Catiline's candidature. It also helps in deciding which election is at issue and on what grounds Volcacius was really able to block the candidature. If Catiline had returned from Africa with the intention of standing in the first election—July 66—it is inconceivable that he would have neglected to hand in his name within the specified period. It is more likely that Catiline's announced intention to stand for the consulship was motivated by news of the disqualification of Sulla and Autronius. He therefore returned from Africa in time to canvass for the supplementary election, held after the trial, possibly in September/October 66; cf. Cassius Dio 36.44.3f. The device used by Volcacius was to insist that he was ineligible because he was not included among the list of can-

didates for the normal July election; the second election was not to be a normal one with full repetition of preliminaries but simply a purified repeat of the first election. For possible political motivation behind Volcacius' decision see Syme 91; Sumner, *op. cit.*

nequiverat: in spite of strong MSS support for *nequiverit*, editors prefer *nequiverat* on grounds that it is better to make the dependent clause state a fact rather than an impression in the mind of the consul. Hardy accepts *nequiverit* as conveying officially stated grounds for refusal but makes no attempt to explain the tense.

18.4. **Cn. Piso:** Cn. Calpurnius Piso, quaestor in 65, an avowed enemy of Pompeius; see *RE* III.1376ff. The elements of S.'s description—*adulescens nobilis summae audaciae, egens*, who exploits *malum publicum* (37.7) because of *inopia and mali mores*—so closely echo the features noted of Catiline's following (chs. 14, 16, 37) as to give weight to the theory that from the moral standpoint S. viewed the state of mind which expressed itself ultimately in the rebellion of 63 as a continuing and long-implanted propensity. By acting in concert with Piso Catiline is simply being true to his essential nature. On the force of *factiosus* here see on 20.4 n. *nam idem velle* etc., 32.2. n. *opes factionis.*

18.5. **cum hoc . . . Hispanias mittere:** in spite of the paraphernalia of accuracy represented by the cluster of specific dates and the announcement of a specific programme for a coup, S.'s account of the conspiracy of 66 bristles with improbabilities—Appendix IV.

Catiline is reported (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.15) to have appeared armed in the Forum on Dec. 29, 66. This appearance has been associated with the riots connected with a lawsuit against C. Manilius the author of a bill conferring extraordinary powers on Pompeius (M. Gelzer, *RE* IIA.1696). Evidence for the rioting occurs in Asconius, 60, 66C; Cassius Dio, 36.44.1-2; Plutarch, *Cic.* 9.4ff. This appearance of Catiline may be the origin of his reported part in the story of Jan. 1.

circiter Nonas Decembris: this date, coupled with *Kal. Jan.* and *Non. Feb.*, presents a striking show of chronological accuracy in a writer who is normally so careless or even wilful in this regard. Moreover, only two other precise dates occur in the whole of his extant works (*BC* 17.1, 30.1). Dating may have been used here to suggest an attempt at personal research, promised in *quam verissume potero*, to get the details of a distorted story straight.

L. Cottam et L. Torquatum consules interficere: Catiline's obvious enemy would be Volcacius Tullus who had refused his candidature. The improbability of the story is further emphasised by the fact that in his trial *de repetundis* in 65 Catiline was supported by an imposing list of consulars, including the intended victim, the consul Torquatus (Cicero, *pro Sulla* 81). We know, too, that Cicero himself thought of defending Catiline in order to dispose him in his favour as a fellow candidate for the consulship in the following year (*Att.* 1.2.1). Fenestella's contention that Cicero did actually defend Catiline is convincingly refuted by Asconius (85C). We also learn that an investigation into the matter by Hortensius and the consul Torquatus yielded no result (*pro Sulla* 11-13), although Cassius Dio, 36.44.5 reports intervention by a tribune.

ipsi fascibus conreptis: the substitution of Catiline for Sulla in S.'s version is possibly one of the concrete results of Cicero's speech on behalf of Sulla, where the orator elaborately contrives to combat the statement of Torquatus that the perpetrators were Sulla and Autronius. Later versions, under the influence of different contemporary pressures, omit Catiline—Appendix IV.

ipsi: with the ablative absolute *ipse* is sometimes spoken of as if it too were used absolutely. Thus *ipsi* could be explained here as logically the subject of *fascibus conreptis*, grammatically as nominative to *parabant*. Madvig, *Kl. Philol. Schr.* 367 deals with this so-called absolute usage in connection with *ipse*, *quisque* and *plerique*. Weissenborn, dealing with Livy's use of *ipse*, speaks of a general attempt to treat the ablative absolute as if it were an aorist participle in the nom. or accus. case. See H. D. Naylor, *CR* 15 (1901) 314ff. The preceding *cum hoc* allows of a simpler explanation here: "with him they were to kill the consuls; they themselves would send Piso to Spain".

Pisonem cum exercitu . . . mittere: S. is obviously inventing *ex eventu*. There is no doubt about the connection between Piso and Spain (19.1), but S. is the only one who makes this mission to Spain part of the programme of the alleged conspiracy. It should also be noted that *duas Hispanias* is not consistent with 19.1, where S., supported by *ILS* 875, correctly assigns only *Hispania Citerior* to Piso.

18.6-7. **ea re cognita . . . perniciem machinabantur:** S. is the only one who speaks clearly of two attempts at a coup. The confusion arose from his sources—Appendix IV. In short, S. runs together

two plots which appear in Cicero as distinct, making the second plot a renewal of the first by the same parties, and treating Piso's mission to Spain as part of the original plan. It is unnecessary to expound the inherent absurdity of this postponement, which implies that no counter-action was taken.

18.6. **rursus:** P. H. Damsté, *Mnemosyne* 21 (1893) 216f. objects to *rursus*, which in strict logic implies that the conspiracy had been postponed more than once. His proposal to emend *rursus* to *consulibus* is attractive because it restricts *cognita*—the consuls got wind of it, but in the absence of proof it did not become common knowledge. The possibility of *rursus* emerging from a corruption of an abbreviation of *consulibus* is a reasonable one.

transtulerant: the use of pluperfect for aorist perfect is more common in S. than in any other author.

18.8. **quod ni Catilina maturasset:** in Suetonius' version the coup proves abortive because Crassus failed to appear and Caesar did not give the expected signal by letting his toga drop from his shoulder. S. is inventing on similar lines. *Maturare* appears here for the first time in the sense of doing something too soon (*praepropere agere*). Livy, e.g. 29.12.2 imitates this usage.

pro curia: *pro* in a local sense is normally used in technical expressions or in military parlance, cf. *BJ* 53.1, 92.9, 94.4. See Priscian, 3.49.8K and cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 3.27.

patratum: a solemn archaic verb, a favourite with S., e.g. 53.4, 56.4 and six times in *Bell. Jug.* It occurs twice in Cicero, once framing an old law in appropriately archaic terminology, *Leg.* 2.19 and, perhaps with a note of parody, in *Att.* 1.14.7 *promissa patravit.* It does not occur in Caesar, Suetonius or either Pliny. Its revival by S. may have influenced its use by Livy and Tacitus. It occurs also in *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.10.8, 2.13.4. Quintilian's comment (8.3.44), already noted with regard to *ductare* (11.5), indicates that it was avoided by S.'s contemporaries because in its everyday use it was an obscene word. It is odd that Quintilian writes *patrare bella*, which hardly admits of obscene connotation, and not *patrare bellum* which does give an obscene double-entendre if *patrare* = *paedicare* or, as Persius, 1.18 may suggest, *capere illicere, vel sim.* S.'s usage, however, is intended to recapture the solemnity of its archaic flavour.

19.1. **postea Piso . . . quaestor pro praetore missus est:** the fact of Piso's commission and his title is supported by *CIL*

I^2.749 = *ILS* 875: *Quaestor pro pr. ex s.c. provinciam Hispaniam citeriorem obtinuit.* Under the late Republic a province was normally administered by a proconsul i.e. an ex-consul or ex-praetor. See Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 2.648; J. Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, Leipzig, 1873, 379f. A quaestor normally acted as subordinate to such a governor. If the governor of a province died or left before the arrival of his replacement he was substituted for by his quaestor who governed as *quaestor pro praetore* until the expiry of the official year, and if still on duty after that as *pro quaestore pro praetore.* In this period also if a man who was not a magistrate was appointed at Rome to a special commission of administration in the provinces he was given the acting rank of the highest magistracy he had previously held. Thus Cato on his special appointment to Cyprus in 58 ranked *pro quaestore*, and to give him the requisite *imperium* he was appointed *pro quaestore pro praetore* (Vell. Pat. 2.45.4). A man who went out to a province as *quaestor pro praetore* was a quaestor sent to govern that province, and was attended by *fasces* appropriate to the *imperium* invested in him (Mommsen, *op. cit.* 1.385f.). For a fuller discussion of the technical aspects of these commissions, with full documentation, see J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 52 (1962) 134f.

adnitente Crasso, quod eum . . . cognoverat: the mention of Crassus here, allied with a previous dark rumour in 17.7, has been interpreted as betokening a sinister motivation behind Piso's commission. S. is undoubtedly incorporating the flavour of rumours rife at the time, and he makes no attempt to dispel any doubts about Crassus' possible machinations (see further on 48.4ff.). S. has already connected Piso's commission with the alleged conspiracy of 66 and so we must assume that he saw in it some deeper and darker designs.

There need not be anything startling or sinister in the appointment of Piso to Hither Spain. He was despatched *pro praetore*, i.e. with *imperium* as 'acting governor' of the province. This can only mean that the province was without a governor. Governors may have been in short supply. Few of the praetors of 66 seem to have wanted a province; T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* 2.151f. has securely established five of the eight praetors of 66. Cicero and Antonius did not govern provinces, and there is no evidence about the others. A second possibility is that the governor of Hither Spain may have died suddenly.

The factor introduced by S.—*adnitente Crasso*—is however significant. Crassus' support of Piso could well be true without thereby necessarily implying that Crassus supported a suppressed conspiracy in 66. The reason given, *quod eum infestum inimicum Cn. Pompeio cognoverat*, points to one of the most important features of the political scene of the period 66-62 B.C., namely the absence and the ultimate homecoming of Pompeius with a victorious army. This factor, reflected in small features such as the support given in 65 to Catiline by Torquatus, an adherent of Pompeius, or Crassus' championship of Piso, a noted enemy of Pompeius, controlled the thoughts and moves of both groups and individuals in those years. While its precise influence can only be surmised, it undoubtedly lay behind the various moves and countermoves of the period, e.g. the attempt by Crassus to enrol the Transpadanes on the list of citizens, successfully thwarted by his fellow-censor, L. Catulus (Cassius Dio, 37.9.3); or the move by Crassus, blocked by Catulus, to annex Egypt (Cicero, *de leg. agr.* 2.44; Plutarch, *Crass.* 13.1). Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* 5.171 n., points out that fragments of Cicero's speech, *De Rege Alexandrino* prove it to have been delivered at this time. Caesar's supposed efforts to secure control of Egypt at this time (Suetonius, *Jul.* 11) is probably the product of anti-Caesarian propaganda in the 50s. Syme puts the point succinctly when he states (102) that the deleterious consequences of absorption by modern scholars in the doubtful conspiracy of 66 has been to neglect the factor of the absence of Pompeius from 66 to 62, to neglect to look for links between Pompeius and the persons or ambitions of tribunes, consuls and conspirators. Recently this factor has attracted more attention, though conclusions are sometimes vitiated by over-imaginative deductions made from too little real evidence. The following may be added to R. Syme's *Roman Revolution*, 28ff.—E. T. Salmon, *AJP* 56 (1935) 302ff.; H. Frisch, *Class. et Med.* 9 (1947) 28ff.; W. Hoffmann, *Gymnasium*, 66 (1959) 459ff.; C. Meier, *Athenaeum* 40 (1962) 103ff.

infestum inimicum: a traditional doublet, cf. Cicero, *pro Quinct.* 10, *pro Sulla* 15, 2*Verr.* 3.34; Livy, 22.39.13. See Introd. p. 18.

19.2. **neque tamen senatus . . . formidulosa erat:** this duplication of reasons for the Senate's action in commissioning Piso reflects both the uncertainty of the sources and of S. himself. The

first *quippe foedum hominem . . . volebat,* which suggests fear on the part of the Senate, is repeated in Asconius, 92C; Cassius Dio, 36.44.5; Suetonius, *Jul.* 9.3 and is patently absurd both as a motive and as a solution to supposed fears. The second, *simul quia . . . formidulosa erat,* probably reflects the political thinking of the time. S. is reporting the feeling of "waiting for Pompeius" which also finds contemporary expression, especially in Cicero, in frequent references to the homecoming of Sulla. The sending of Piso to Spain is, however, immediately shown to be ineffective as a political move because of Piso's death, and there is no evidence of any further interest in Spain on the part of Crassus. It got to the stage where any move initiated by Crassus or suspected of being so was interpreted as a move to counteract the prestige and personal power of Pompeius.

quippe: see on 11.8 *quippe.*

simul: S. frequently uses this copulative to introduce a second reason, cf. 17.7 *simul confisum*; 20.3 *sed quia . . . simul quia*; 56.5 *simul . . . existumans.* The usage may indicate his feeling that the reason so introduced is less important than the reason already given.

boni: S. usually avoids the use of this term in a party-political sense; it is mostly used in contrast to *malus,* e.g. 2.6, 11.2. But in a political context like this one the term is used technically, cf. 33.2, 34.2, 48.4 and often in *Bell. Jug.* Cicero tries to expound and expand the meaning of the term in *Att.* 7.7.5ff., *pro Sest.* 97ff. See U. Paananen, *S.'s politico-social Terminology,* Helsinki, 1972.

potentia Pompei: the influence exerted in Rome by P., even though absent, and expectations concerning P.'s attitude on his return. S.'s own attitude to P. emerges more clearly in *Hist.* 2.16-19, 3.88M. It is by no means a favourable one. On *potentia* see 12.1, 20.8 nn. *potentia.*

19.3. **in provincia:** the order of the words will not support the conjunction *in provinciam . . . iter faciens. In provincia* makes complete sense; *in provinciam* of several codices is nonsense.

19.4-5. **sunt qui . . . in medio relinquemus:** S. often gives the appearance of carefulness in reporting the truth by the use of such phrases as *sunt qui dicant,* e.g. 17.7, 22.1, 48.7ff. He may be following the Herodotean practice of laying all available material before the reader, without committing himself as to its truth or falsity. Ogilvie (on Livy, 5.33.4) notes that the refusal by an

author to commit himself to the solution of a disputed problem is characteristic of the ethnographical style in particular. We may have here an extension of this diffidence.

19.4. **dicant:** many codices read *dicunt*. In view of S.'s use of the indicative after *quippe qui* (see on 48.2) this is not incompatible with Sallustian usage. But in other occurrences of similar phraseology (quoted above) the use of the subjunctive is uncontested. See L-H-S, 558 on the occasional persistence of the indicative in sentences like this.

19.5. **Cn. Pompei . . . clientis:** does not refer to the Roman institution of patronage and clientship, but to the people whom Caesar, *BC* 1.75.2, 3.88.4 calls *beneficiarii*; they were adherents made by Pompeius when he held command in the province in the war against Sertorius, 76-2 B.C.

voluntate eius: even though Pompeius was in the far East, this phrase could mean "with his consent", as in Caesar, *BG* 1.35.3. I prefer, however, to take *eius* as objective genitive, the phrase being equivalent to *quia ei studebant*. Normally a preposition (*in*, *erga*) is used when the governing noun is connected with a personal pronoun, but examples of the genitive do occur: e.g. *curator eius*, *CIL* I^2.200.55 *et saepe; odium tui*, Plautus, *Hecyr*. 219, 580; *mei satietate*, Cicero, *pro Mur*. 21.

nunquam Hispanos . . . perpessos: not quite accurate. L. Piso Frugi was killed in Spain as propraetor in 112 B.C. (Cicero, 2*Verr*. 4.56). Cf. Livy's report of the murder of Hasdrubal, 21.2.6 and the note on Spanish savagery in *Bell. Hisp*. 42.4.

Chs. 20-22: *The first speech of Catiline and its effects*

There are four speeches in this monograph and their placing is of some importance in the structure of the work. Thus the conspiracy proper begins and ends with speeches from Catiline (chs. 20 and 58), while the crux of the conspiracy, the meaning of this movement, the means used to combat it are presented in the great Caesar-Cato debate (chs. 51 and 52).

If S. is following, as seems most probable, the example of Thucydides (see Introd. p. 11), it is likely that he had some evidence for the speeches he reports. Like Thucydides (1.22) his method seems to be to keep as closely as possible to "the overall purport or purpose of what was actually said", and the speeches are written in such a way as to make his speakers say "what was called for

by each situation". Even if he had been able to reproduce *ipsissima verba,* S. certainly would not have done so; they would have been accomodated to his own style, to effect the overall consistency which Roman taste required. See further on 31.6 *orationem ... luculentam.*

Speeches also are almost inevitably a very important part of 'indirect characterisation'; see, e.g. D. M. Pippidi, "Tacite et Tibère", in *Autour de Tibère,* Bucharest 1944. The speaker will be presented in a way which is consistent with the writer's viewpoint from the outset. Within this limitation the speeches, although they may incorporate analysis and synthesis on the part of the writer, do reflect historical events, and they remain one of the most dramatic and effective means of conveying the essential historical influences and events as the historian saw them.

It is more important to enquire what S. expected from his speeches. In general it can be said that he divorces himself from the speeches when composing his narrative and he allows his speakers to express their own points of view. Speakers are allowed to explain or justify their conduct or policy, to make their assessment of events or motives appear as the only true assessment. S. never directly comments on the speeches made but part of his artistry is to allow what is said by a speaker to be contrasted with the facts of the situation as he narrates them. Irony is often the result of this procedure. The speeches in their own way present facets of the truth, and, combined with S.'s direct narrative, contribute to the presentation of the whole truth in so far as this is possible of attainment. In addition, S.'s abstention from intervention gives room for a more direct impact on the reader of the character of his speakers.

In the case of a Roman historian one should not overlook the effect of the training in rhetoric which was the chief feature of Roman education. It is possible to maintain, for instance, that S.'s speeches conform in structure and content to the schema of the rhetorical schools. Such is the view, e.g. of R. Ullmann, *La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite* etc., Oslo, 1927, 17, 25-6, who divides all the Sallustian speeches into precise segments according to the precepts of rhetoric, and partitions this first speech as follows: *prooemium,* 2-4; κατάστασις 5-6; *tractatio,* 7-14; conclusion, 15-17. Here as elsewhere it is difficult to decide whether the author really follows rhetorical doctrine,

the difficulty arising largely from the fact that rhetorical doctrine is not entirely artificial but abstracted from normal practice. In the notes below the speech has been divided according to changes in the tone of the speech which can fairly be taken to reflect the emphasis desired by the speaker.

The definitive work on the speeches in S. is that of H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Über die Reden und Briefe bei Sallust*, Preisschrift Leipzig, 1888. See also Büchner, 160-181. On this speech see O. Seel, *Sallust*, Leipzig, 1930, 72f.; M. L. Paladini, *Latomus* 20 (1961) 3ff.; H. Engemann, *Der Altspr. Unterricht* 5 (1962) 27ff.

20.1. **multa saepe:** a redundancy which is very common, cf. 52.7 *saepenumero . . . multa verba*. It occurs frequently in the introductions to Cicero's speeches.

tametsi . . . tamen: very common in this monograph, e.g. 3.2, 3.4, 21.1, 48.5, 52.9 and in the earlier part of *Bell. Jug.* It is always used with the indic. except for *BJ* 38.9 (*orat. obliq.*). Up to this point in *Bell. Jug.* it is used 12 times; through the remainder of that monograph and in the *Histories* it does not occur. It also gradually disappears in Cicero's works; in his writings between 63 and 42 B.C. *quamquam . . . tamen* (which is also S.'s substitute, 13 times in *BJ*) and *etsi* (*etiamsi*) . . . *tamen* predominate.

in rem fore: the expression *in rem esse* is archaic (Introd. p. 18). Cf. Plautus, *Aul.* 129; Terence, *Andr.* 546, *Hecyr.* 102, 249; Livy, 22.3.2, 26.44.7, 30.4.6 etc.

atque ibi: parataxis. Introd. p. 14f.

arbitris procul amotis: the more usual expression is *arbitris remotis*, e.g. Cicero, *Off.* 3.112; Livy, 2.4.5, 7.5.4 *et al.*

orationem huiusce modi habuit: Thucydides used a similar formula (ἔλεγε τοιάδε) to justify the free reconstruction of speeches actually delivered. The tense of *habuit*, in contrast with the vivid presents (*vidit, secedit*) which precede, is explained by the fact that with *huiusce modi* it is a historic statement which as such requires the past.

20.2-4. **ni virtus . . . firma amicitia est:** this introduction at once lays down the main goal of the undertaking—*dominatio*—and betrays that mixture of high hopes and uncertainty (*spes magna . . . incerta*) which appears at several places in the speech; such a mixture of feeling underlies the two direct appeals in the speech (9-10, 14-15). By a skilful use of time-honoured concepts and phrases (*virtus, fides, amicitia*) Catiline emphasises that the pros-

pects of success lie in the character and circumstances of his hearers. Perversion of vocabulary, which Cato (52.11) marks as a leading characteristic of a degenerate age, is a notable feature of the speech throughout. Catiline's use of such *vocabula* is rendered the more insidious in that on many points he hits on the truth as S. himself saw it and expressed it: e.g. 20.7 *potentia paucorum,* cf. 39.1f; *divitiae-inopia* 20.11, cf. 12.3, 13.1, 37.6; *luxuria-avaritia* 20.12, cf. 10.4, 11.6; etc. Like all propaganda, the more of the truth it contains the more insidiously effective does it become.

It is to be doubted if Catiline's hearers were deceived. They heard what they wanted to hear, and their real interests reveal themselves in ch. 21, in the question time after the speech. For Catiline it is largely an exercise in rhetoric; for S. it is another way of illuminating and illustrating the moral concepts he has already dealt with.

20.2. **virtus fidesque . . . spectata . . . foret:** *foret* and *forent* occur in the MSS. *Foret,* of course, can stand with *spectata* as feminine singular agreeing with the nearest noun. But *forent* can be defended on grounds of Sallustian practice. In *BJ* 38.8, 52.4, 68.1 we find that if the predicate refers to more than one feminine noun it is put in the neuter plural; a construction rare in Cicero and not found in Caesar. In some instances, e.g. *BJ* 70.2, 73.6, 114.4, perhaps because one of the nouns in each pair is concrete and plural, the predicate is feminine plural; the apparent exception at *BC* 51.12 may be explained by the fact that *fama* and *fortuna* discussed there are those of several people. At *BC* 3.4, 5.7 we note in addition that the relative pronoun, when it refers to two or more singular feminine nouns, is neuter plural. See further Kühner-Stegmann 44ff., 56ff.; Kroll, 288 n. 2. For the rhetorical commonplace *virtus . . . spectata* cf. Livy, 2.7.9.

nequiquam opportuna . . . cecidisset: *nequiquam* does not go with *opportuna*; *opportuna* is predicative to *cecidisset.*

spes magna: stands by itself and is balanced by the appropriate phrase *dominatio in manibus.*

dominatio: "the power for which we are reaching". Catiline is anticipating the result of his coup, a well-worn rhetorical device. Later he substitutes the more respectable *nosmet ipsi in libertatem vindicamus* as the *leitmotiv* of the speech.

neque ego per ignaviam aut vana ingenia: S.'s use of the abstract for the concrete (e.g. *servitia urbana,* 24.4) allows us to

interpret *per ignaviam* as equivalent to *per ignavos homines*; we have noted a usage similar to *vana ingenia* already at 8.3 (*magna ingenia*). The reference would thus be to people interested in a change of government and would continue the chain of thought started by *virtus fidesque vostra,* where *ignavia* corresponds to *virtus* and *vana ingenia* to *fides*. But see R. Syme, *Ph.* 106 (1962) 300f., answered by E. Skard, *SO* 40 (1965) 49ff.

incerta pro certis: cf. on 17.6. A note of uncertainty to which is added a note of desperation which marks both of Catiline's speeches.

20.3. **multis et magnis tempestatibus:** the alliterative doublet, *multus-magnus* gives an archaic colouring (Introd. p. 18).

vos: Catiline's audience was a mixed lot—cf. 17.3ff. Some were senators baulked in their ambitions and looking to a coup as the means to attain positions previously denied them. There were *equites* anxious for political advancement; descendants of decayed aristocratic houses seeking to revive the status their ancestors had enjoyed; businessmen with money and connections looking, perhaps, to the financial opportunities that a period of disruption might provide; *municipales* who had also suffered the frustration of failure to win office; men whose mode of life or whose incompetence had ensnared them heavily in debt and thus deprived them of their customary standard of living. In short, they were men whose families had tasted power and who wanted more—cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.19: *honores quos quieta re publica desperant perturbata se consequi posse arbitrabantur*; Sallust, *BC* 37.10. Consequently the political slogans which occur in this speech—*libertas, dignitas, amicitia, gratia*—and which have many nuances have primarily to be interpreted in the light of this immediate context.

eo: takes up *sed quia*; cf. 52.11.

maxumum atque pulcherrumum facinus incipere: the *magnus-pulcher* doublet S. probably imitated from Cato, e.g. 25.7, 28.4J. In prose usage *incipere* (*Thes. LL.* 7.915) with a noun in the accus. is fairly rare. It occurs in Cato, *RR*, *summ.* CXLIII: *antequam messem incipias*, and is fairly common in Plautus, e.g. *Amph.* 7 (*res*), *Capt.* 793 (*pugilatum*), *Cas.* 164 (*iter*) and especially with *facinus*, e.g. *Aul.* 460, *Capt.* 753. Cf. Terence, *Andr.* 709 (*initium*). Its use by Livy, e.g. 3.22.6, 7.34.13, 21.21.6 and by Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.10.1, 4.46.2 suggests a phrasing traditional in historiography.

simul quia vobis . . . firma amicitia est: the idea that common

interests lead to friendship is expressed by Demosthenes, *de Cor.* 35 in terms closely paralleled by S. But this was a widely canvassed concept and it appears in a variety of forms, e.g. Plato, *Lysis* 214b, *Phaedrus* 255b; Cicero, *de Amic.* 20; Democritus, fr. 107 (Diels); Seneca, *Ira* 3.34.3 who also, *Ep.* 20,5. uses *idem velle atque idem nolle* as a definition of wisdom. On *simul quia* see 19.2.

20.4. **nam idem velle . . . amicitia est:** the specific meaning of *amicitia* here is made clear by the preceding sentence—*vobis eadem quae mihi bona malaque.*—A similar meaning is given in *BJ* 31.15: *eadem cupere, eadem odisse, eadem metuere . . . haec inter bonos amicitia, inter malos factio est,* an interpretation which is echoed in Catiline's instructions to Cethegus and Lentulus (*ut*) *opes factionis confirment* (32.2).

ea: equivalent to *id* which would resume *idem velle* etc. The pronoun is attracted by the predicate *amicitia* into fem. sing. Cf. 7.6 *eas divitias* etc. On the use of the pronoun in parataxis see Introd. p. 15 and 8.1 n. *ea.*

20.5-8. **sed ego . . . repulsas iudicia egestatem:** this statement of the facts of the contemporary social, economic and political situation contains sufficient truth to answer to the grievances of his hearers, whether these be based on thwarted political ambition or personal bankruptcy. The demagogic character of the speech lies in the skill with which these catchwords are turned to personal aims, both those of the speaker and the variety of aspiration represented in his hearers.

To achieve his effect S. here uses two of his favourite stylistic devices in a marked way. The antithesis between *pauci* and *ceteri,* between the basis of power and influence on the one hand and the results of exclusion on the other is underlined throughout. These opposed concepts are given an emphatic directness by the use of asyndeton (Introd. p. 14).

20.6. **ceterum:** this adverb is often used in *Bell. Jug.* with the adversative force of "but" (cf. *BC* 51.26), a sense in which the word is not used in Cicero and Caesar. Both here and in 17.6 it is used with the meaning "besides" to signify that he is passing on to another thought.

animus adcenditur: cf. Quintilian, 3.8.45 *sic Catilina apud Sallustium loquitur, ut rem sceleratissimam non malitia sed indignatione videatur audere.*

nosmet ipsi: *ipsi* is the reading of V and of the corrected ver-

sions of P, A, C, Q; the rest read *ipsos*. When Cicero strengthens the personal pronoun with *-met* it is his practice to put *ipse* in the same case, e.g. *Tusc. Disp.* 2.47 *nobismet ipsis*, *Off.* 1.29. S., e.g. *BJ* 18.7 *semet ipsi* (cf. *BJ* 31.6, 41.9, *BC* 23.2, *Hist.* 3.48.6M) puts *ipse* in the nominative. Moreover the meaning is here strongly dependent on nominative *ipsi*: "unless we assert our liberty ourselves", i.e. *nos ipsi nobis libertatis auctores esse debemus, in aliis nulla spes* (Kritz). Livy uses the same construction in a very similar context (3.56.3): *a cuius crudelitate vosmet ipsi armis vindicastis.*

vindicamus: *vindicare* has a primary meaning "to claim" from which *vindicare aliquem in libertatem* becomes "to claim a person into liberty", "to deliver". From this primary notion of 'delivering' come the subsidiary notions of defending, avenging, punishing as in 9.4, 10.6.

The phrases *vindicare in libertatem, vindex libertatis* dominate the political vocabulary of the post-Sullan period; cf. Cicero, *Leg. Agr.* 2.4, *pro Flacc.* 25, *pro Sest.* 144, *Fam.* 2.5.2, 10.31.5, *Phil.* 2.30; Caesar, *BC* 1.22.5. See Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge, 1950; R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1952, 155; Earl, 54ff. In our present context *libertas* simply means a more equitable share of political power, of *gloria* and of wealth.

20.7. **nam postquam res publica . . . formidini essemus:** sums up the features of social and economic contrast which is the basic key to the political manoeuvring of the final decades of the Republic. The passage is full of slogans—*pauci potentes, nobiles-ignobiles, gratia, auctoritas*—and contains sufficient truth to make Catiline's statement effective as a rallying-cry.

The *potentia paucorum* was economic and political and was the specific result of the Sullan regime. For the economic and political differentiation of the post-Sullan nobility in Rome, based both on the accumulation of large land-holdings and on control of revenue from the provinces, see M. Jaczynowski, *Historia* 11 (1962) 486ff. For the economic factors in general T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore, 1933, 1.300ff.

res publica in paucorum . . . concessit: cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 3.48.6M: *omnes concessere iam in paucorum dominationem, qui per militare nomen aerarium, exercitus, regna, provincias occupavere et arcem habent ex spoliis vestris . . .* For most of Catiline's hearers,

however, the *pauci* were simply the group of prominent families who controlled access to the leading offices in the state.

reges tetrarchae: a phrase which was already a cliché; cf. Cicero, *pro Mil.* 76, *in Vat.* 29, *de Dom.* 60; Sallust, *Hist.* 4.56M; *Bell. Alex.* 78; Horace, *Sat.* 1.3.12; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.25.3. *Tetrarcha* originally signified one who ruled over a fourth part of a country; it was later used to designate a minor potentate without reference to the extent of territory ruled.

populi nationes: see on 10.1.

strenui boni nobiles atque ignobiles: on this type of listing see Introd. p. 14. *Strenuus-bonus*, a doublet long in use, e.g. Cato, 16.10, 39.3J, generally refers to an old concept of the Roman as *fortis vir sapiensque*, a concept which appears in the Scipionic *elogia* (*CIL* I^2 6, 7). It is meant, therefore, to include all the facets of *virtus*; Sallust comes closest to this ideal meaning in *BJ* 7.5 *et proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio*. But in the present passage *boni* is strained and overloaded if it means *boni consilio* and rather ambiguous if it is general, i.e. opposed to *mali* (cf. *BJ* 67.2); in this context one must also think of *boni* = "conservatives" (cf. 19.2). In short either clumsy writing on the part of S. or a cleverly misleading use of time-honoured phrasing by Catiline.

Nobiles-ignobiles includes all the conditions of men to whom in the face of *paucorum potentia* Catiline's programme should, and in the event, did have appeal. Hence, as Seel (*Sallust* etc. 73, n. 2) points out, Schwartz's (671 n. 2) desire to erase *atque ignobiles* would destroy the rhythm and meaning of the sentence.

nobiles: in S. is never bereft of its socio-political connotation, cf. 5.1, 18.4, 23.3, 48.5, 52.24, *BJ* 95.3. The other common meaning "renowned", "famous" is never given to *nobilis*; he uses *clarus* instead, e.g. 3.1, 55.6, *BJ* 16.2, 63.7, 70.2. The oligarchic feature of the rule of the nobility is indicated by *pauci*, e.g. 39.1, 58.11, *BJ* 3.4, 31.19, *Hist.* 1.12, 48.6M. Catiline's statement holds also the resentment of a *nobilis* who is excluded from what he considers to be his birthright (cf. 35.3).

volgus: a bitterly savage word, "mere rabble". Cf. Justinus, 41.1.4 *Parthi veluti vulgus sine nomine praeda victorum fuere*; Horace, *Od.* 2.16.40.

20.8. **itaque omnis gratia . . . egestatem:** the bitterness of feeling and the demagogic purpose of arousing his hearers are indicated by the double asyndeton, involving in each case a set

of four words—*gratia potentia honos divitiae* and *pericula repulsas iudicia egestatem*. While *egestatem* answers to *divitiae* and perhaps *repulsas* to *honos*, there is no real attempt at a precise symmetry of concepts here. It is sufficient for Catiline's purpose to hammer home the contrast of two basic concepts, the Haves and the Have-nots.

omnis gratia . . . apud illos sunt: a charge repeated in *BJ* 41.7 *paucorum arbitrio belli domique agitabatur; penes eosdem aerarium provinciae magistratus gloriae triumphique erant.*

gratia: a word, as E. Wistrand, *Eranos* 39 (1941) 17ff., points out, whose development in meaning is a typical symptom of the social and political circumstances of the Roman Republic. *Gratia* is very closely connected with the features of *amicitia* and *clientela* and signifies the influence which one acquires through *beneficia*, which place *amici* and *clientes* under the obligation of duty (*officium*). Cf. 49.1, *BJ* 35.8. *Beneficia* are the means to obtain *gratia*, and by this means to win *potentia*, cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.6.4f. On *gratia* and related concepts see Pöschl, *Grundwerte röm. Staatsgesinnung* etc. 91ff., 97; Gelzer, *Die Nobilität* etc. 61. On *gratia* in particular see C. Moussy, *Gratia et sa famille*, Paris, 1966, 375-91. In this context Catiline is using the concept in a more generalised way—he and many of his hearers, some in spite of aristocratic connections, have lacked the influence and the backing which has enabled others, some of them *non digni homines* (35.3), to win office and status and to retain the *dignitas* gained thereby.

apud illos: for the meaning given to *apud* here "in their hands" (cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.1.1) S. uses *penes* in *Bell. Jug.* and in *Hist.*; e.g. *BJ* 14.1, 26.2, *Hist.* 1.55.7, 13, 23, 24M. See A. Gagner, *Studien z. Bedeutung d. Praep. apud*, 1931, 108; Löfstedt, *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 1911, 252f.

aut ubi: i.e. *aut apud quos.*

nobis reliquere . . . egestatem: a note of personal grievance, the consequence of Catiline's political failure, emerges here. This antithesis with what is possessed by the *pauci potentes* shows the extent and the quality of the aspirations of the conspirators. Nevertheless the evils indicated by *iudicia egestas* were real. See further on ch. 33. The contrast between *BJ* 41.10-42.1 when the Gracchi *vindicare plebem in libertatem et paucorum scelera patefacere coepere*, where the emphasis is on the *plebem*, and Catiline's cry *nosmet ipsi vindicamus in libertatem* is a marked and deliberate

one. For Catiline, *libertas* means *auctoritas, gratia, potentia, honos,* and above all *divitiae.* The weakness of the Republican system, where opponents of whatever party happened to be in power could always charge the government with exploitation of revenues and abuse of the constitution and could rally, as in this case, a band of ne'er-do-wells under the respectable banner of *libertas,* is most clearly underlined by this speech. The reasoning with which Catiline justifies his activity does not differ essentially from the claims put forward by Pompeius and Caesar in their climb to power. The general thought expressed here echoes Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.31.

20.9-10. **quae quo usque . . . cetera res expediet:** having thus skilfully and emphatically laid down the reasons for his action, Catiline now launches into the first exhortation of his speech. This is also marked by an adept manipulation of traditional concepts—*virtus, honos, decus*—and a careful juxtaposition of pessimism and optimism.

20.9. **quae quo usque . . . per dedecus amittere?:** the note of desperation is used here as a means of arousing to a pitch of exasperation which will lead to action. It should be contrasted with that note of desperation which is nearer to hopelessness, which marks Catiline's second speech (esp. 58.4ff.). Indeed, as Skard, *SO* Suppl. 15 (1956) 31 remarks, this present speech, with its *o fortissumi viri,* its question *nonne emori per virtutem praestat?*; its enumeration of the rewards of victory in sec. 14, bears a close resemblance to a general's speech before battle. Cf. the speech of Hannibal in Livy, 21.43.5. Other familiar material is also present: the whole passage seems to echo Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 30 and the question of death and *dedecus* is posed in Thucydides, 2.43.6.

The echo of the famous opening phrase of Cicero's first Catilinarian oration (*quae quo usque tandem*) has been interpreted by those who accept Schwartz's thesis of S.'s partisanship as a malicious gibe at Cicero's expense. Neither the immediate needs of the speech nor the placing of this phrase within it support such a view. A similar phrase occurs in *Hist.* 1.77.17M. Livy, too, makes an ancient Roman orator use a like expression at the opening of a speech, 6.18.5 *quo usque tandem ignorabitis vires vestras?* This formula, which expresses surprised irritation, could well have been derived from earlier historiography. See on 22.3 for S.'s attitude to Cicero in general.

nonne emori . . . per dedecus amittere?: a clever use by Catiline of the tenets of the traditional ideal of *virtus*, tenets which find expression in Plautus, *Capt.* 690 *qui per virtutem periit, at non interit*, and which are given clearer expression elsewhere by S., *Hist.* 1.55.15M *estne viris reliqui aliud quam solvere iniuriam aut mori per virtutem?*

ubi fueris: a generic or causal subjunctive.

20.10. **verum enim vero . . . cetera res expediet:** Catiline is too good an orator to make an *adhortatio* purely pessimistic in content and to leave his hearers with the idea of death clinging to the contrasted concepts of *virtus* and *dedecus*. He moves over into the area of optimism, an optimism based on vague foundations and which is partly responsible for the air of uncertainty which marks the concluding portion of the speech.

verum enim vero: see on 2.9.

pro . . . fidem: the phrase calling upon gods and men occurs in a variety of forms; as here in Terence, *Heaut.* 61, but cf. Ennius, *Sc.* 187V; Terence, *Andr.* 732 (*pro Iuppiter*); Terence, *Adelph.* 447 (*pro di immortales*).

in manu nobis est: if we read *vobis*, the version of a correcting hand in several codices, we would have the meaning, as in *BJ* 14.13, 31.5 of "victory depends on you". The sentiment required here is "victory is within our grasp" which would repeat the idea of 20.2 *dominatio in manibus frustra fuissent*. This appears to be the only place where the singular *in manu* is used in this metaphorical sense (*Thes. LL.* 8.363.12ff.); elsewhere, e.g. Livy, 5.20.1, 6.8.10, *in manibus* is the rule. This factor may have prompted Jordan's feeling that *in manibus* of some inferior codices should be taken with *nobis* to convey the required meaning. However, in the literal use of the phrase both singular and plural occur; e.g. Plautus, *Asin.* 463, *Amph.* 406 (*in manu*), Cicero, *2Verr.* 2.187 (*in manibus*). S.'s use of *in manu* can therefore adequately convey his meaning.

viget aetas animus valet: note the combination of chiasmus and alliteration. The alliterative doublet *viget-valet* has already appeared in Cicero, *pro Mil.* 85 and it reappears in Ovid, *Amor.* 3.7.67.

divitiis: neither Catiline nor his followers would pause to savour the irony (cf. 20.14) implicit in this.

consenuerunt: with S. *-ere* is the normal form for 3rd plur. perf.; the *-erunt* ending occurs only four times in this monograph

(*dixerunt*, 51.9, *sumpserunt*, 51.38, *venerunt*, 45.3) three of them in speeches. The *-ere* form is less common than the accepted literary form *-erunt* in Plautus, they are about equal in Terence; the shorter form is extremely rare in Cicero and Caesar (Cicero, *Orat.* 157; Quintilian, 1.5.44). Cato is one writer in whom the *-ere* form predominates and it was from him no doubt that S. borrowed it. Later both Livy and Tacitus make free use of the shorter form. The distribution of these forms in poetry is studied with minute care by D. W. Pye, *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1963, 1ff. There is no corresponding study for prose.

For the general idea enunciated here cf. Livy, 1.22.2 *senescere igitur civitatem otio ratus undique materiam excitandi belli quaerebat.*

cetera res expediet: has been interpreted as "the rest will follow in due course". A better explanation is to take *res* as 'action' and translate "action will effect what remains to be done".

20.11-13. **etenim quis mortalium . . . praeter miseram animam:** in this second statement of motive the purely demagogic character of the speech emerges: the whole socio-economic basis for justifiable resentment against the government is reduced to terms of the Haves and Have-nots; the whole chain of concepts in the first statement (secs. 5-8) contracts to a single concept—the concentration is on *divitiae*. The content of this section corresponds very closely to the strictures by Cato in ch. 52 against the prevailing luxury of the ruling class, and to the opinion on Roman degeneration already expressed by S. himself in chs. 11-13. Catiline is still twisting fact to suit his own purposes, and antithesis continues to be the device by which he emphasises his points.

20.11. **superare:** i.e. *abunde esse*. Thus *BJ* 64.1 *quoi quamquam virtus gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant.* Cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.83; Horace, *Sat.* 2.2.102; Livy, 2.17.4.

in extruendo mari et montibus coaequandis: see on 13.1.

binas aut amplius domos continuare: referring to the erection of two houses in close connection with each other, communicating throughout. For a similar type of extravagance cf. Livy, 34.4.9 *ingens cupido agros continuandi.*

amplius is used for *plures* as in *BJ* 80.6. This use arises from a looseness of construction, *amplius* not being an attribute but an apposition or a parenthesis, as in Virgil, *Ecl.* 3.105 *tris pateat caeli spatium—non amplius—ulnas.* So here the original mode of expression would be *binas—aut amplius—domos.*

20.12. **toreumata:** i.e. *vasa caelata* (11.6). The only truly Greek word in the monograph, in marked contrast to S.'s last work, the *Histories*, where Greek words are more frequent. Its use here is quite natural in a context dealing with luxury. Cf. Varro, *LL* 5.131, speaking of garments, *multa post luxuria attulit, quorum vocabula apparet esse Graeca*; Cicero, 2*Verr.* 4.38.

emunt ... aedificant: for a similar description of luxury cf. Suetonius, *Jul.* 46, and note Nepos' praise of Atticus (13.1) *cum esset pecuniosus nemo illo minus fuit emax, minus aedificator.*

vexant: see on 5.8.

20.13. **mala res spes multo asperior:** note the chiasmus (Introd. p. 15) and cf. 5.4. n. *satis eloquentiae* etc.

20.14-15. **quin igitur ... vos hortantur:** this final exhortation with its emphasis on *praemia et spolia belli* reinforces the impression of concentration on riches given in the preceding statement of motive, and this in spite of repetition of slogans such as *libertas, decus, gloria.* As in the first statement (5-8) asyndeton is the means used to emphasise the important concepts.

Quin, a composite of old ablative *qui* and *ne* used with the indicative is common in early Latin, e.g. Plautus, *Men.* 247; Terence, *Heaut.* 832. Its use in later Latin seems to be confined to contexts of high emotion for the most part, e.g. Cicero, *Fam.* 7.8.2; Catullus, 76.11; Livy, 1.57.7.

20.14. **libertas:** is given emphasis by hyperbaton (Introd. p. 15); it is still equivalent to *licentia.*

fortuna: see 10.1 n. *saevire fortuna.*

20.15. **magis quam oratio mea:** part of Catiline's skill throughout has been to let the facts of the social, economic and political situation speak for him. Here he ends on a note of objectivity—these facts compel to revolution. However, the addition of *belli spolia magnifica* leaves no doubt as to what was the most attractive factor to atiline and most of his hearers.

20.16-17. **vel imperatore ... parati estis:** this conclusion repeats the basic concepts of the introduction, viz. *fides*, with the interesting twist that it is now a matter of *fides* on the part of the leader, and *spes*. Yet in spite of the categorical enumeration of motive, of the insistent emphasis on the rewards of revolution, this speech ends on a note of uncertainty—*ut spero*; *nisi forte me animus fallit.* In this way the artistry of S. appears, in that the speech is also composed with the reader in mind.

20.16. **vel imperatore vel milite:** a rhetorical *topos* which echoes Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.3.15. Cf. Caesar, *BC* 5.33.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 10.4; Curtius, 3.11.7; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.66.2. This was one promise honoured in the sequel, cf. 60.4 *strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exequebatur.*

20.17. **haec ipsa, ut spero, vobiscum una consul agam:** Catiline's hope for the consulship was perhaps the surest plank in his overall plan at this time. After his acquittal on the charge of *repetundae* in 65 he stood forth as one of the most promising candidates for 64, a promise recognised by Cicero (*Att.* 1.2.1). He had many things in his favour: nobility of birth, powerful support and the advantage of a political situation which was subject to all kinds of pressure. See on 23.5.

This combination of an expectation of properly constituted power and the seizure of power by unconstitutional means is a feature which is somewhat puzzling. As A. N. Sherwin-White (*JRS* 46 (1956) 6) remarks, "men who want to be consular are by definition not men who want to start revolutions". Catiline, of course, need not necessarily fit into this general rule, and it may be S.'s way of underlining his undoubted derangement when he notes that Catiline sets out on his last journey decked with the insignia of the highest republican office. But see further on 21.3, 36.2.

21.1. **postquam accepere... opis spei haberent:** the inadequacy of the speech as a statement of programme and detailed planning is brought out by the questions put to Catiline at its conclusion. The inadequacy is to be accounted for mainly by the fact that the decision to revolt, which resulted ultimately from successive electoral defeats, was a gradually developed resolve strengthened by the withdrawal of the patronage by which Catiline might have hoped to achieve a position he considered worthy of his birth and abilities. There is present, too, the factor that most of his audience had already been contacted individually and were, moreover, ripe for revolution at any time (*illis quieta movere magna merces videbatur*) and Catiline, whose activities throughout are marked above all by rashness and haste, may have overlooked the need to give at least the appearance of careful planning and clear objectives. At any rate the practical questions as to goals and methods are answered in a manner consistent with the demagogic flourish and shallowness of thought which characterised his

speech. What is surprising is that men like Lentulus should have gone away apparently satisfied with a programme so obviously deficient. But see on 44.5.

quibus mala abunde omnia erant: on S.'s use of adverbs as adjectival predicates see Introd. p. 20. Cf. 20.2 (*frustra*), 23.6, 58.9, *BJ* 14.1, 87.4, 88.2, *Hist.* 2.82M. It is a construction frequent in the comic poets, e.g. Plautus, *Amph.* 974 and in the letters of Cicero, e.g. *Att.* 14.22.2, and hence may be a colloquialism.

tametsi . . . tamen: see on 20.1.

condicio belli: *condicio* (*Thes. LL.* 4.127ff.) can be equivalent to *lex,* as in Cicero, *pro Marc.* 12 *condicio victoriae.* It also means "terms" "conditions", equivalent to *natura* or *fortuna* as in *BJ* 79.8; cf. Caesar, *BG* 7.77.15; Livy, 22.52.4, 37.32.9. The query here refers to what was to be got from the war (*praemia*) and what kind of war it was to be (*quid opis aut spei*). On *foret* see on 14.7 *compertum foret.*

praemia: on this point they had already been informed individually, no doubt in terms which appealed to their particular needs and desires (17.1, cf. 14.6).

quid ubique: it is often difficult to decide whether *-que* after *ubi* is connective or generalising, especially since generalising *-que* seems to have arisen from connective, as in, e.g. *ubi quisque,* 'where and who' = 'where each'. The problem has been discussed by F. Skutsch, *NJ* Suppl. 27 (1902) 84ff.; L. Hotz, *Die Enklisenstellung des Pronomens 'quisque',* Diss. Zürich, 1941; P. Ferrarino, *Memorie R. Accad. d. scienze d. Ist. di Bologna,* ser. IV, Vol. IV, 1942; W. John, *Glotta* 33 (1954) 287ff.; J. Gonda, *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954) 177ff., 265ff., esp. 285ff.

Here, as at 27.1 *-que* is generalising. If it were to be connective S. would probably have written *quid opis aut spei ubique haberent.*

opis aut spei: S. has already used the traditional combination *res-spes* in this sentence (cf. 20.2); moreover the use of *opis* enables him to avoid the unpleasant jingle *rei aut spei.*

21.2. **tum Catilina . . . lubido victorum fert:** these promises of Catiline reinforce the impression that S. looked on the conspiracy as closely connected with the effect of the Sullan regime. The detail of the objectives desired and promised recalls most vividly the Sullan reign of terror, and whatever genuine social reforms might have motivated some of those concerned are clouded by S.'s insistence that this movement was the expression of moral

degeneration, an insistence clearly conveyed in the closing words: *quae bellum atque lubido victorum fert.* For the thought cf. Isocrates, *Panath.* 259 and *Antid.* 127.

tabulas novas proscriptionem . . . alia omnia: for this asyndeton of six words cf. Cato, *RR* 149.2J; *CIL* 8.25902. S. continues to use a stylistic device which figured prominently in Catiline's speech. The asyndeton here conveys the rhetorical flourish, the repetition of slogans familiar and pleasing.

tabulas novas: Catiline's seems to have been the first attempt to abolish debt, not by legislation, but by armed revolt. *Tabulae novae* did not mean a mere lessening of debts (*lex de aere alieno*) but rather their complete abolition. Unfortunately no single law pertaining to the abolition of debts has survived and this makes analysis of the term difficult. It is not unlikely that the slogan *tabulae novae* is connected with the concept *res novae* and simply implies a forgetting of all that was written down. On the social and economic factors which lie behind such a slogan and the extent to which *cuncta plebs* could have been swayed by it see further on chs. 33 and 37.

proscriptionem locupletium: recalls most vividly the Sullan regime in which this device of murder by proclamation was first used to acquire financial and political ascendancy. Under Sulla the names of the enemies of the new regime condemned to die were set up in public places with the promise of certain reward for the head of each person so proscribed. New lists (*tabulae proscriptionis*) were repeatedly published as new names occurred to the dictator or were suggested by his adherents, many of whom enriched themselves at the expense of their victims. Cf. 37.9; Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 16; Suetonius, *Aug.* 27.

sacerdotia: the higher priesthoods (cf. on 49.2) were sought after for the political influence they carried with them. But even minor priesthoods were prized for the privileges accruing to the office, e.g. exemption from military service. In the last century of the Republic election and not co-optation was used to fill vacancies in the more important priestly colleges. On *sacerdotia* see further Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 2.22ff.; Latte, *Röm. Religionsgeschichte*, München, 1960, 394ff.

21.3. **praeterea esse . . . initium agundi facturum:** this enumeration of probable grounds for success may be designed, since they are statements by Catiline, to underline S.'s con-

viction that this coup was from first to last marked by the rashness, the haste, the complete lack of definite objectives which allows it to be classed as the insane act of a deranged mind. At any rate none of the factors listed here as a firm basis for success is at all convincing—chance is still the ruling element.

esse in Hispania citeriore Pisonem: S. has already described the death of Piso in ch. 19. By the time of Catiline's speech Piso was dead, though the date of his death cannot be determined. The only indication is in Asconius 92C with reference to Cicero's *in Tog. Cand.*, just prior to the elections in 64 B.C.: *Piso autem cum haec dicerentur perierat.* S. thus has provided the corrective to C.'s statement.

in Mauretania cum exercitu P. Sittium Nucerinum: another inaccuracy, which S. does not correct. This is excusable in that it is not easy to ascertain the movements of Sittius between 66 and 64. A Campanian banker, he lent a large sum of money to the Mauretanian king and this, as Cicero points out (*pro Sulla* 56) necessitated visits to Mauretania. Cicero's remark was in reply to the prosecutor of P. Sulla who alleged that Sittius had been sent by Sulla to Hispania Ulterior to stir up trouble in the interests of Catiline. Sittius' exploits at the head of an army came later, both as a condottiere and during the Civil War: *Bell. Afr.* 48, 93; Cassius Dio, 43.3; Appian, *BC* 4.54. See *RE* IIIA.409(3).

C. Antonium: given the cognomen Hybrida (Pliny, *NH* 8.213). Son of the celebrated orator M. Antonius and brother of M. Antonius Creticus, father of the triumvir. Expelled from the Senate in 70 along with Lentulus Sura, he was praetor with Cicero in 66 and his colleague in the consulship in 63. In 59 he was prosecuted for oppression in Macedonia by Caelius Rufus, defended by Cicero but found guilty and exiled. Cicero rebuked Antony, his nephew, for making no effort to have his uncle rehabilitated (*Phil.* 2.56, 98f.), but he does turn up again in 42, holding the office of censor (*CIL* I^2. p. 64; *ILS* 6204). S.'s presentation of him (26.1, 26.4, 59.4) is by no means favourable. Cf. *Comm. Pet.* 8; Asconius, 84, 93C; *RE* I.2577(19).

quem sibi collegam fore speraret: Catiline had good grounds for this expectation. According to Asconius, 83C: *coierant enim ambo ut Ciceronem consulatu deicerent, adiutoribus usi firmissimis M. Crasso et C. Caesare.*

et omnibus necessitudinibus circumventum: Antonius

fitted in well with the type of following attracted by Catiline's programme (cf. 14.2, 16.4). In the event, however, Catiline's expectation proved misplaced; Cicero found a safer and surer means of solving Antonius' financial difficulties and had little trouble in securing his neutrality (26.4).

cum eo se consule . . . facturum: see on 20.17.

21.4. **ad hoc maledictis . . . praedae fuerat:** S. reverts to the generalised picture of ch. 14, with the emphasis on the personal desires of the individual conspirators and on Catiline's chief asset, his ability to communicate on this basis with a widely varied following. The device of addressing his followers *nominatim*, which reinforces the impression of a military speech, is a commonplace in such speeches, e.g. Thucydides, 7.69.2; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 5.3.46-8; Caesar, *BG* 2.52.2; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.23.1; Cf. Sallust, *BC* 59.5, *BJ* 49.4.

omnis bonos: on the term *boni* see 19.2. Cicero's definition (*pro Sest.* 97f.) places emphasis on economic stability and this, in the present context, may be the meaning intended.

victoriae Sullanae: a constant element in S.'s accounts of Catiline's support; cf. 16.4, 28.4, 37.6. Lest we should be in any doubt as to the type of person meant S. adds *quibus ea* (*sc. victoria*) *praedae fuerat.*

21.5. **animos alacris:** a Catonic combination, cf. 20.4J.

cohortatus: the relative rarity of such a participial construction in S. is another indication of his deliberate choosing of a looser form of sentence structure than the more careful periodic structure of his age.

ut petitionem suam curae haberent: more than once Catiline seems to imply that the success of the conspiracy was dependent on success at the elections, cf. 24.1, 26.1. The absurdity of the juxtaposition of consulship and conspiracy, noted at 20.17, is added to here by the fact that Catiline has already expressed hopes for himself and Antonius and now addresses a final appeal for support to a gathering which included one other candidate in the same election, L. Cassius Longinus; cf. Asconius, 82C.

curae haberent: a much less common expression than *curae esse*, from which it derives by analogy.

22.1-2. **fuere ea tempestate . . . tanti facinoris conscii:** reference has been made on 19.4 to the possible significance of this form of reporting in S.; it seems clear here that he is not

prepared to vouch for the accuracy of the story of human sacrifice which follows. It may be he felt it his duty to report rumours circulating at the time; the view that such a rumour was included as a malicious gibe at Cicero is discussed below. The form of the story is consistent with a feature of his work remarked upon at 14.2 n. *pene*, viz. his restraint and brevity in the handling of erotic or horrific material.

Sources, besides S., for such a report are Cassius Dio, 37.30.3; Florus, 2.12.4; Plutarch, *Cic.* 10.3; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9. As in the case of the so-called conspiracy of 66, these sources vary both in the extent of their report and in the details provided. It is significant that Cicero, who would hardly have neglected such promising material for invective, makes no mention of the incident.

Such a rumour had its origin in the ritual practices of foreign religions in Rome conducted in great secrecy and therefore liable to distortion. A factor also is the constant manipulation of religion for political and propaganda purposes. On this see E. Manni, *Athenaeum* 24 (1946) 55ff., who connects the ritual described here with the cult of Ma-Bellona and connects with it the political application of religious activity which is indicated by the use of the Sibylline books by the *gens Cornelia* (cf. Lentulus, 47.2). The charge of ritual murder was a constant feature of the general polemic against exclusive sects; e.g. the Bacchants, Livy, 39.13.13; the Jews, Josephus, *contra Apionem* 2.91ff.; the early Christians, Pliny, *Ep.* 10.96.7; Justin, 1*Apol.* 26; Athenagoras, *Legat.* 31f.; Theophilus of Antioch, *ad Autoc.* 3.4; Eusebius, *HE* 5.1.1ff.; Origen, *contra Celsum*, 6.27; Tertullian, *Apol.* 8.2ff., *ad Nat.* 1.7.23ff.; Minucius Felix, 30.

22.1. **popularis:** the common label for the people's party (*populi partes*), viz. *populares*, is never used by S. nor, indeed, does he make use of the equally common term for the aristocrats, *optimates*. He uses *popularis*, as here, to mean "fellow-participants", cf. 24.1, 52.14 and note that all three examples occur with the genitive. In *BJ* 7.1, 35.9, 74.1 *popularis* is used to denote "fellow-countryman".

adigeret: conjectured by Cortius for *adiceret* of the vast majority of the codices, and later confirmed by *Eugraph. cod. Leid.* 93; cf. Zimmermann, *Der Sallusttext im Altertum*, 81. *Adigere* is the appropriate verb in such a context; it is used especially of imposing

military oaths (*Thes. LL.* 1.678.72ff.). Cf. Caesar, *BG* 7.67.1, *BC* 1.76.3.

humani corporis sanguinem: according to Cassius Dio, 37.30.3 a boy was slain by the conspirators and after an oath had been made over his entrails Catiline with his adherents partook of these. Dio's is the most detailed account and the vagueness of the story in general is best expressed in Tertullian's words (*Apol.* 9.9): *nescio quid et sub Catilina degustatum est.* The possibility remains that the Catilinarians may have in some form imitated a method of imparting solemnity and a greater binding force to a compact by the tasting of blood, either of a victim or of the contracting parties. Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.47.2 reports such a practice among the Caucasian tribes, and Herodotus has similar reports concerning the Medes (1.74) and the Scythians (4.70).

22.2. **inde:** I prefer to interpret this as = *ex ea potione*; *degustare* normally takes the accusative, e.g. Pliny, *NH* 8.82, 18.8; Pliny, *Ep.* 9.20.2. Gellius, 5.16.5 also uses *ex. Inde,* of course, could be taken as temporal, equivalent to *deinde.*

execrationem: i.e. curses in the event of treachery; cf. Livy, 10.38.10.

consuevit: rarely used impersonally (*Thes. LL.* 4.551). With the more usual word *solet* S. omits *facere-fieri,* e.g. 29.2, 30.2, *BJ* 15.5, 25.3, 59.3 etc. In *Hist.* 1.44 and 2.39M both the verb of custom and the infinitive are omitted.

atque eo dicationem fecisse: *dicationem* is Kurfess' final conjecture (*Phil. Woch.* 56, 1936, 110f.) for this well-known crux. Earlier he had proposed *dedicationem* (*Phil. Woch.* 44, 1928, 1358f.). Most codices present *atque eo dictitare fecisse*; a few have *dicto,* some omit the words or have them crossed out, others, according to Dietsch, have *dictam rem, dicta re,* or *dictas res.*

Those who feel that *atque eo dictitare* might be retained hold that the passage can be explained in one of two ways: (a) *fuere qui dicerent C. dictitare se eo fecisse*; (b) *dictitare* is historic infinitive, a variation of the preceding *dicerent.* Explanation (a) does not explain why *dictitare* should be present when *aperuisse* and *circumtulisse* are in the past tense. Explanation (b) would fit in better with S.'s obvious anxiety to disclaim any responsibility for the story, but it would leave *fecisse* with neither subject nor object expressed (A. M. Cook, ed. 1888).

Nearly all commentators however rightly hold that the passage

is corrupt. Remedies have been suggested. Some are extreme, such as that of Ritschl (*Rh. Mus.* 1886, 317) and Wesenberg (*Burs. Jahresber.* 100, 1874-77) viz. to excise *dictitare* as a marginal note. Excision is no cure; the transmission is too strong. Emendations have been forthcoming, some of them palaeographically dubious. Thus, e.g. *divinam rem* (Ahlberg), *deiectam rem* (Ryba), *dictatam rem* (Constans), *diram rem* (Klimscha). Kurfess justifies the rare *dicationem fecisse* ("to conduct a solemn act of enrolment") by reference to Cicero, *pro Balb.* 28. But it should be noted that Cicero has to support *dicatione* by a prior use of *dicare.* Some editors, e.g. Wirz, accept Dietsch's conjecture of a complicated gloss [*dict*]*ita*[*re*] *fecisse* and simplify the text to *atque eo ita fecisse.* Maurenbrecher, *Burs. Jahresber.* 101, 1878-98, 232, reports several other conjectures of the type noted above; I agree with his judgement that of all these that of Bergk: *idque eo dicitur fecisse* is the most satisfactory. None of the remedies suggested is compelling; the passage remains a *locus desperatus* and should be presented as such: †*atque eo dictitare fecisse.*

alius alii . . . conscii: *alii* is dative depending on *conscius* supplied from *conscii*; cf. 34.2 *conscius sibi*; Terence, *Heaut.* 121; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.43.1; Curtius, 6.10.20. The use of singular *alius* with plural verb or predicate is noted under 6.2.

22.3. **Ciceronis invidiam:** *Ciceronis*, objective genitive. Cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.16 *invidia non in eo qui invidet solum dicitur, sed etiam in eo cui invidetur.* S. describes subjective *invidia* in 6.3, 23.6.

S.'s attitude to Cicero has long been the subject of debate. The view that Cicero was the victim of systematic defamation was first promulgated by Schwartz (*Hermes* 32 (1897) 575ff.), an assumption which was stoutly defended (e.g. by G. Funaioli, *RE* IA.1922f.) and which prevailed for a long time. It still finds supporters, e.g. F. Lämmli, *Mus. Helv.* 3 (1946) 112; M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians*, 1947, 56; E. Löfstedt, *Roman Literary Portraits*, 1958, 100f.

S. is charged with deliberate omissions regarding Cicero's contribution (see, e.g. at 31.6), with references to Cicero which are charged with irony or malice (e.g. at 43.1), and with using Cicero, against his own statements elsewhere, as witness for Caesar's innocence of the charge of complicity in the conspiracy (e.g. at 49.1). One of the basic points of Schwartz's partisan thesis was

that S. wrote his *Bell. Cat.* to answer Cicero's posthumous *de Consiliis Suis* (on which cf. Asconius, 83C; Plutarch, *Crass.* 13.2; Cassius Dio, 39.10.2-3) in which the orator implicated both Caesar and Crassus. Such views have also influenced comment on the debate of chs. 51-52 and the *synkrisis* of ch. 54. See H. M. Last, *Mélanges Marouzeau* (1948) 368.

Such an assumption of bias should now be regarded as unfounded. The charges against S. have been refuted in varying detail by J. Tolkiehn, *Phil. Woch.* 45 (1925) 1404f.; W. A. Baehrens, *NWzA* 4 (1926) 38ff.; O. Seel, *Sallust* etc., 1930, 46ff., 63ff.; W. Schur, *Sallust* etc., 1934, 183ff.; W. Steidle, *Historia*, Einzelschr. 3 (1958) 15f., 91ff.; A. La Penna, *Stud. it. fil. class.* 31 (1959) 18ff. The best short treatments of the topic are those by T. R. S. Broughton, *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 34ff. and by Syme, 105ff. Syme notes a "melancholy fact that the truth, the 'bescheidene Wahrheit' was there all the time in Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch. Roms*, 5^2 (1919) 463ff". The details of these charges and their refutation are discussed more fully as they arise in the text.

nobis ea res . . . parum conperta est: this sentence, along with *satis conpertum habebat* of 29.1, has been held to recall a well-known jest at Cicero's expense. Cicero's pride in having discovered so many facts about the conspiracy is expressed in *in Cat.* 1.10 with the words *comperi omnia*. The verb was taken up by enemies such as C. Antonius and P. Clodius, cf. *Att.* 1.14.5, *Fam.* 5.5.2. But *conperior* is a favourite word of S., used six times in *Bell. Cat.* (2.2, 14.7, 22.3, 29.1, 36.2, 58.1), nine times in *Bell. Jug.* and once in the *Histories*; this fact weakens its effectiveness as the vehicle of a gibe at Cicero. The use of the verb here contains irony, but irony aimed at the story he is reporting—"in proportion to its importance the matter is not sufficiently known to me to make a statement on it".

nobis: i.e. *nobis non satis notum pro magnitudine* etc.

Chs. 23-26: *Activity between June 64 and the elections in the summer of 63 B.C.*

S.'s shifting to June 64 of a meeting at Catiline's house, which is authenticated in Cicero, *pro Mur.* 50 as having taken place shortly before the elections in 63, and much of the content of the speech there delivered, referring to designs of armed rebellion, are clearly anachronistic; see C. John, *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Suppl. 8, 1876, 763ff.

This antedating of clearly formed plans and of a meeting of the revolutionaries which W. Steidle, *Historia*, Einzelschr. 3 (1958) 91f. justifies on artistic grounds as a dramatic way in which to open his account of the conspiracy, means that S. has little to report in the period up to Catiline's defeat in the elections of 63, when the decision to open rebellion was actually taken.

The narrative which covers this period (i) contains material which once again demonstrates his preoccupation with the moral aspect of the conspiracy, notably his account of the widening of Catiline's support in chs. 24 and 25; (ii) involves S. in statements which are hardly credible, especially his introduction of Curius and Fulvia as informers thus early, and the reasons he gives for Cicero's election to the consulship for 63 (ch. 23); (iii) includes accounts of unrest in this period which are reported in other sources and thus partly support S.'s contention that revolutionary designs were in train even before Catiline's final defeat at the consular elections. On this latter feature see Steidle, *op. cit.*

23.1-3. **sed in ea coniuratione . . . quam solitus erat:** this portrait of Curius, with such familiar phrases as *natus haud obscuro loco; flagitiis atque facinoribus coopertus*, places him immediately as a typical Catilinarian—he has all the qualifications of birth, depravity, lack of funds, luxurious tastes, which feature in the picture of Catiline's followers in chs. 14-16. The part he is to play as Cicero's chief informer justifies to some extent S.'s unusually detailed picture. There is even present an unprecedented grain of humour in the description of the man's boasting and impudence (23.3).

23.1. **flagitiis atque facinoribus coopertus:** cf. 14.1. S.'s liking for doublets makes it unlikely that he intended the distinction made by Augustine, *Doctr. Chr.* 3.10.6: *quod agit indomita cupiditas ad corrumpendum animum et corpus suum, flagitium vocatur; quod autem agit ut alteri noceat, facinus dicitur.* It would seem rather that S. is drawing upon a traditional store of concept and phraseology; cf. Livy's *coopertus stupris* (39.15.14) and his frequent use of the combination *flagitium-facinus*, e.g. 39.13.10, 39.16.5; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.50.2 *et al.* See also Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.18, *pro Sulla* 16, *pro Scaur.* 13.

quem censores senatu probri gratia moverant: the censors of 70 instituted a severe purge of the Senate, excluding 64 Senators in all. Among these were Q. Curius (cf. Asconius, 93C; Appian, *BC* 2.3), Cicero's consular colleague, C. Antonius (cf. 21.3; Asconius

84C) and P. Cornelius Lentulus (17.3; cf. Plutarch, *Cic.* 17.1; Cassius Dio, 37.30.4). See J. Suolahti, *The Roman Censors*, Helsinki, 1963, 458ff.

probri gratia: cf. Cicero's formulation of a law (*Leg.* 3.3.7); *censores . . . probrum in senatu ne relinquunto.* This could imply that *gratia* here is equivalent to *propter*, a somewhat rare use (*Thes. LL.* 6.2237.11ff.). If *gratia* is to retain its normal meaning then *probrum* is to be taken as equivalent to *ignominia*; i.e. they removed him from the Senate in order to disgrace him *probris notandis.*

23.2. **vanitas:** "lack of judgement"; cf. *vana ingenia*, 20.2 and Gellius, 18.4.

reticere . . . occultare: note the chiasmus.

neque dicere neque facere quicquam pensi habebat: cf. the description of Clodius in Vell. Pat. 2.45.1 (*Clodius*) *quique dicendi neque faciendi ullum nisi quem vellet nosset modum.* The infinitives *dicere-facere* are epexegetic. S.'s phrase has several parallels in Livy, e.g. 26.15.4, 34.49.7. On *quicquam pensi* see on 5.6.

23.3. **Fulvia muliere nobili:** the identity of this female remains a mystery. There is no evidence to suggest that she was connected with the Fulvia who was married in turn to Clodius, Curio and M. Antonius. The presence of the mysterious M. Fulvius Nobilior among the conspirators (17.3) has led to the conjecture of L. Herrmann, *REA* 31 (1929) 127 that S. wrote Fulvia muliere Nobili<oris>, specifically to distinguish her from her more notorious namesake but the use of the term *muliere* makes this unlikely. Florus, 2.12.6, using a term of abuse rather than a description of class or social type, calls her *vilissimum scortum*; some editors of Val. Max. 9.1.8 name as Fulvia one of the prime exhibits at a banquet in honour of the consul Metellus Scipio and the tribunes of 52, and F. Münzer, *RE* VII.280(112) identifies S.'s spy with this woman.

consuetudo: a word often used to indicate an intimacy which, in the case of men and women, was always sexual. Cf. Plautus, *Cist.* 94, *Pseud.* 64; Terence, *Adelph.* 666; Curtius, 4.10.31; Suetonius, *Calig.* 24.1; Justin, 8.6; Eutropius, 6.22. The word is also used of an honourable liaison, e.g. Terence, *Hecyr.* 404; Justin, 12.4.2.

maria montisque: commentators have objected to this phrase because of its rarity and have contended that the proverbial

expression was *auri montes* (cf. Terence, *Phorm.* 68 and Donatus *ad loc.*; Plautus, *Aul.* 701) or *argenti montes* (cf. Plautus, *Miles* 1065). See A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter* etc. s.v. *mons*. The saying appears in various forms, e.g. Juvenal, 12.129 *montibus aurum exaequare*; Persius, Sat. 3.56 *magnos promittere montes*. Thus J. Boot, *Mnemosyne* 17 (1890) 357 conjectured that S. wrote *auri montes polliceri* and that *auri* was corrupted to *maria*, the *-que* being subsequently added to *montis*. *Maria montisque* is a strong transmission and there is no reason why S. should not have introduced his own variation; the alliteration rather points to his version being a popular expression.

etiam: so Kurfess with Gellius; *interdum* of the MSS makes good sense and should be retained.

23.4. **at Fulvia . . . causa cognita:** the general austerity of S.'s narrative is emphasised if this somewhat arid sentence is compared with the lively and colourful tale of seduction through which Diodorus conveys the same information (40.5).

insolentia<e>: this, the version of a correcting hand in N, rather than the *insolentia* of the other MSS; the meaning intended is indicated by the preceding *quam solitus erat.*

occultum habuit: the force of this circumlocution of perfect passive participle with *habere* is often to emphasise the enduring quality of the action while the perfect active simply reports the action. Thus Livy, 26.11.9 (*templum*) *exornatum habebant*; Cicero, *de imp. Cn. Pomp.* 18 (*pecunias*) *collocatas habent. Occultum habuit* here is equivalent to *retinuit occultans* (Kritz).

de Catilinae coniuratione . . . compluribus narravit: if by this S. means that Fulvia was reporting on precise plans of rebellion and not merely retailing rumours occasioned by Catiline's activity during this period (cf. 24), it is hard to believe that such a leakage of information could have gone on so long unnoticed. S. states that Cicero was provided with information from the beginning of his consulate (26.3) but he does not discuss the nature and extent of such information. If it were a leakage about Catiline's ultimate plans it is incredible that Catiline himself should not have been aware of the presence of informers or that Cicero should have been unable to act decisively until the arrest of the Allobroges (ch. 45). If Fulvia is not repeating at this stage fairly vague rumours it would seem that S. has been forced, as a result of his antedating of the whole conspiracy, to introduce thus early as crucial factors

in the drama the figures of Curius and Fulvia who are still informing in November (28.2). See further on 26.3.

quae quoque modo: the readings *quae quomodo, quae et quomodo, quae et quoque modo* could be explained as corruptions of *quae quoque modo,* the reading accepted by editors. These have differed in their interpretation, the main difficulty being whether *quoque* should be taken as equivalent to *et quo* or looked upon as ablative of *quisque* (Jacobs) to convey "she reported what she had heard in whatever way". Although *et quo modo* seems to be ruled out by *sublato auctore,* the use of *quoque* = *et quo* is consistent with S.'s practice elsewhere. Stangl's parallel with *BJ* 30.1 is unconvincing, since *quoque* = *et quo* is there used in an indirect question; Jacob's interpretation is preferable.

23.5. **ea res in primis . . . M. Tullio Ciceroni**: this explanation of Cicero's success, viz. fear of his competitors, is echoed in Appian, *BC* 2.2 and Plutarch, *Cic.* 10-11 and has been accepted by many historians, e.g. Mommsen, Rice Holmes and Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie,* 22ff. Other historians, e.g. Heitland, *Rom. Rep.* 3.77ff.; Cary, *CAH* IX.482ff.; R. E. Smith, *Cicero,* 92ff. hold that Cicero's elevation was meant to counter the schemes of Crassus and Caesar. This theory is based solely on Asconius' comments on Cicero's *Tog. Cand.* (83C): *Coierant enim ambo (Catilina et Antonius) ut Ciceronem consulatu deicerent, adiutoribus usi firmissimis M. Crasso et C. Caesare... ei enim acerrimi ac potentissimi fuerunt Ciceronis refragatores cum petiit consulatum... et hoc ipse Cicero in expositione consiliorum suorum significat.* Thus Asconius' information apparently had its source in Cicero's posthumous *de Consiliis Suis,* not a reliable witness for events of the 60s; see *Att.* 2.6.2, 14.17.6; Cassius Dio, 39.10.1-3; Plutarch, *Crass.* 13.2-3; cf. P. A. Brunt, *CR* 71 (1957) 193ff.

Cicero headed the poll with the unanimous vote of all the centuries (see, e.g. *in Vat.* 6, *in Pis.* 3, *Leg. Agr.* 2.4, 2.7) against the formidable opposition of two patrician candidates, Catiline and P. Sulpicius Galba, two plebeian nobles, C. Antonius and L. Cassius Longinus, two estimable candidates from senatorial families, Q. Cornificius and C. Licinius Sacerdos (Asconius, 82C). The success of the *novus homo* is perhaps, therefore, to be accounted for by the inclusion of factors hinted at in *Att.* 1.1.2, viz. that by diligent expansion of his contacts he had gained a wide variety of support—from *publicani,* from the *equester ordo* generally, from beneficiaries

of his skill as an advocate, from the *municipia*, from several of Rome's leading politicians. See T. P. Wiseman, *New Men*, 134ff.; E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation*, 136ff.

23.6. **namque antea ... superbia post fuere:** in keeping with his general view of S.'s partisanship, Schwartz (*Hermes* 32 (1897) 576) took this as a thinly disguised sneer at Cicero. This is hard to justify in the light of *quamvis egregius*. Moreover, exactly the same comment appears in *BJ* 63.7 with reference to the relations between Marius and Metellus, where *invidia* and *superbia* are underlined as the primary elements of Metellus' conduct and where the attitude to *novi homines* is expressed in similar terms. These features are for S. symptomatic for the attitude of *nobiles* to *novi* in general.

pleraque nobilitas invidia aestuabat ... credebant: for the use of singular *pleraque* see on 17.6. On the *inconcinnitas* produced by the mixture of singular and plural verbs with a collective noun see Introd. p. 16.

The conflict between two concepts of nobility finds sharper expression in the speech of Marius (*BJ* 85) where the *vetus nobilitas* of ancestry and family position is contrasted with the personal *nobilitas* which *ex virtute coepit* (cf. 7.6). It forms part of the argumentation against the closed-shop attitude of the entrenched families and finds particular expression in connection with *novi homines* —thus Cicero, *pro Sest.* 136, *pro Mur.* 17, *de Leg. Agr.* 2.3, 2*Verr.* 3.7; *Com. Pet.* 7. On the concept *invidia* see E. Wistrand, *Eranos* 44 (1946) 355ff.

quamvis egregius homo novos: *quamvis egregius* "however distinguished"; *quamvis* is used only once again by S., also with an adjective, *Hist.* 3.48.20M. On the order of the words *homo novos* see Introd p. 16. In the first century B.C. the *nobiles* had become an exclusive clique; they maintained that only descendants of consulars or at least sons of Senators were fit for the consulship. Cf. M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität* etc. 28; J. Vogt, *Homo Novus*, Stuttgart, 1926, 24 n. 4. The counter claim of *novi homines* was that a man's worthiness for office should be decided *moribus non maioribus*— Cicero, *in Pis.* 2; cf. H. Last, *CAH* IX.138f.

sed ubi periculum advenit ... post fuere: S. has to account for Cicero's election in spite of the fact that he was competing against four *nobiles*—Catiline, Antonius, P. Galba and L. Cassius— and that no *novus homo* had been elected since the consulship of

C. Coelius Caldus in 94; cf. *Com. Pet.* 7, 11; Sallust, *BJ* 63.6. See on sec. 5. On the use of *post* see Introd. p. 20, and 21.1 n.

quibus mala abunde . . .

24.1. **igitur comitiis habitis . . . et C. Antonius:** this electoral defeat, according to S., in no way diminishes the revolutionary fervour of Catiline. His actions are marked by *furor*, an element already noted in ch. 14, 15.3-5 *et al.* The scope of the conspiracy is widened to include all conditions of men and even women. Both of these factors—the element of madness in Catiline and the expansion of a following which continues to be described in moral terms—are consistent with S.'s view of the conspiracy from the outset. The content of chs. 24-25 has been viewed by some as a type of stop-gap material forced upon S. as a consequence of placing the start of the conspiracy a year too early. Nevertheless some of the activity he ascribes to this period can be supported by evidence from elsewhere and the inclusion of women of Sempronia's type fits in with his view of the conspiracy as primarily a symptom of moral decline.

quod factum . . . concusserat: the idea of the conspiracy, in so far as it aimed at social revolution, as being dependent on Catiline's success in the consular elections, a facet implied in Catiline's speech, seems to be corroborated here. But, according to S., even before the second electoral defeat in 63 Catiline was preparing for the more violent measures of armed rebellion. The widening of the aims of the conspiracy is answered by a widening of the type of support given to it.

concusserat: for the aoristic use of the pluperfect see Introd. p. 20 and *transtulerant* in 18.6. *Concusserat,* as Kritz notes, implies the idea: *Catilina nihilominus nefaria consilia acerrime persequebatur quamquam ea res initio populares coniurationis concusserat.*

24.2. **neque tamen . . . belli faciundi:** such activity which seems to have armed rebellion as its objective even thus early is hinted at in Cicero, *pro Mur.* 49, where the participation of Sullan colonists is specifically mentioned, and *ibid.* 51 where violent schemes are mentioned. Plutarch, *Cic.* 10.3 is more specific: armed insurrection was already taking place in Etruria and Cisalpine Gaul.

minuebatur . . . agitare . . . parare etc.: for the use of historic infinitives coupled with ordinary indicative tenses see Introd. p. 20.

sumptam mutuam: cf. Plautus, *Asin.* 248; Livy, 32.2.2, 35.49.11. The adjective *mutuus* (*mutare*) in this idiom ("borrowed") implies that there is a change of the object lent, the return being made by an equivalent. *Commodare,* "to lend" supposes the object lent to be restored as it was given. Cf. Isidorus, *Differ.* 1.363; Cicero, *pro Flacc.* 46. The distinction was not always observed by Latin writers, e.g. Phaedrus, 1.17.3(?); Cicero, *pro Cael.* 32.

Faesulas: cf. Cicero, *pro Mur.* 49. Faesulae, now Fiesole, a town of Etruria, N. E. of Florentia. See on 27.1.

Manlium: had held a commission in Sulla's army where he had acquired considerable military experience and great wealth, the latter being soon dissipated (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.20; Plutarch, *Cic.* 14; Cassius Dio, 37.30.5). He was the leader of discontented Sullan colonists from Arretium and Faesulae. See *RE* XIV.1156 (18). The rumours of unrest in Etruria noted above, the fact that Manlius took up arms on 27 Oct. (30.1; cf. *in Cat.* 1.7) some time before the Catilinarian conspirators were allotted their specific tasks at the meeting in Laeca's house on Nov. 6, the contents of the letter of Manlius to Marcius Rex (ch. 33) indicate that S. viewed the activity of Manlius as being initially independent of that of Catiline; inspired by the same basic motives, both men moved into armed revolt after Catiline's final electoral defeat. See K. H. Waters, *Historia* 19 (1970) 201; R. Seager, *Historia* 22 (1973) 240f. Cicero's comment on Manlius is less clear: at *in Cat.* 1.7 he talks of him as *audaciae satellitem atque administrum tuae*; at 2.20 it is *Manlius cui nunc Catilina succedit.*

princeps fuit belli faciundi: *princeps* used in a temporal sense, not as equivalent to *dux.* Cf. Caesar, *BG* 7.2.1 *principes se ex omnibus bellum facturos pollicentur*; Nepos, *Hamil.* 3.3; Cicero, *Phil.* 5.44.

24.3. **plurumos quoiusque generis:** cf. 28.4, 39.6 *quoiusque modi genus hominum.* The conjunction of the genitive of quality of *modus* and *genus* with pronouns *huiusce, cuiusque* etc. is so common that it forms a unit equivalent to *quilibet, quivis.*

ubi aetas tantummodo . . . modum fecerat: "when age had set bounds to their source of income but not to their taste for luxury". *Neque* here is equivalent to *sed non.*

24.4. **servitia urbana sollicitare:** on S.'s use of abstract nouns see 20.2 n. *per ignaviam* . . . This statement concerning the use of slaves seems to be contradicted by Catiline's refusal to enlist slaves in his army (56.5) in spite of recommendations by Lentulus

(44.5f.). It may be of course that a limited use of urban slaves was planned to foment unrest and so to enhance his election chances in 63. But the memory of Spartacus was too vivid to allow Catiline to alienate sympathy at this early stage for his cause by the enrolment of runaway slaves in his army. See further on 30.3.

25.1. **sed in iis erat Sempronia:** this portrait has been considered a digression which is difficult to account for both in terms of content and of structure. See Appendix V.

The following general points concerning this character-sketch should be noted:

(i) The close parallel in content and structure with the portrait of Catiline. See W. Steidle, *Historia,* Einzelschr. 3 (1958) 4.

(ii) The interweaving of elements of intellect, accomplishment and great charm with the description of conduct of deepest depravity and abandoned daring, a combination which undoubtedly had great fascination for the historian (cf. Oppermann, *Gymnasium* 65 (1958) 192f.; Seel, *Cicero,* Stuttgart², 1962, 74f.) and which receives appropriate notice in the biting antithesis of the final sentence. It is a dichotomy of intellectual potential and actual conduct present in the portrait of Catiline (cf. M. Rambaud, *REL* 24 (1946) 120ff.; Vretska, *SO* 31 (1955) 105f.).

(iii) The fascinating puzzle of such a personality and the extent to which Sempronia conveys S.'s view of a moral degeneration, all the more dangerous in being combined with powers of intellect and personality, is conveyed by a type of circular composition in which the vices of his subject form the heart of his description (3-4), a fatal rottenness which is heightened by a prior description of aristocratic lineage and beauty (2) and a concluding recognition of her intellectual ability.

Sempronia: of the illustrious house of the Sempronii, from which the Gracchi and other distinguished men derived their descent. F. Münzer's (*RE* IIA.1446(103)) conjecture that she was a daughter of C. Gracchus has not found much support. Syme, 134f. suggests that she might be the sister of Sempronia, *Tuditani filia,* mother of Fulvia who was married to Clodius etc. For a contrary view see A. Pastorino, *Giorn. It. di Fil.* 3 (1950) 358ff.

virilis audaciae facinora: cf. the description of Electra in Vell. Pat. 1.1.3 *virilis animi femina*; of Fulvia, wife of Clodius etc. in Vell. Pat. 2.74.3 *nihil muliebre praeter corpus gerens,* and in Florus, 2.16 *virilis militiae uxor.*

25.2. **viro liberis satis fortunata:** Sempronia was the wife of D. Junius Brutus, consul 77, absent from Rome in 63. She is generally taken to be the mother of Decimus Brutus, *legatus* of Caesar in Gaul, later one of his assassins. R. Syme, *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.* 114 (1960) 326f. has suggested that Decimus might only have been her stepson. *Satis fortunata* might, of course, have been intended as ironical but it more probably implies that Sempronia had every inducement to be a typical *matrona Romana*. The contrast with the ideal mother of heroes, the traditional portrait of a Cornelia such as the mother of the Gracchi is another proof of the general deterioration of morals.

psallere [**et**] **saltare:** the MSS vary considerably, some omitting the copula, some adding *canere* or *cantare*, all of which variations suggest glosses. On the intrusion of unimportant words (such as *atque* in this sentence) see on 15.5 n. *igitur colos exanguis*.

Since *docta* is constructed with the ablative (*litteris Graecis* etc.), it is unlikely that the infinitives *psallere, saltare* and the accus. *multa alia* are subordinated to it. The infinitives are best taken as descriptive infinitives (L-H-S, 367); a verb should be supplied for *multa alia* (e.g. *inerant illi*).

psallere: either to play on a musical instrument or to accompany it at the same time with the voice.

elegantius quam necesse est probae: the implication may be that a good woman had no need to excel in such accomplishments, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 5.1.3 *comis ultra quam antiquis feminis probatum*. It may also carry a hint of undesirable skill, cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.62.2 *mimos actitavit scite magis quam probe*.

Both accomplishments were slow to gain respectability at Rome. On *psallere* cf. Quintilian, 1.10.31 *nec psalteria et spadicas etiam virginibus probis recusanda*; Quintilian, *ibid.* also speaks of (*musica*) *in scaenis effeminata et impudicis modis fracta*. On *saltare*, Cicero, *pro Mur.* 13 speaks of *extrema saltatio, quae est comes multarum deliciarum*; cf. Nepos, *Epam.* 1.2 and Servius *ad Geo.* 1.350 who quotes this Sallustian phrase as a contrast when speaking of *saltationem aptam religioni nec ex ulla arte venientem*. S.'s use of *elegantius*, therefore, would suggest that these accomplishments are to be understood as part of the general decadence, as *instrumenta luxuriae*. On dancing at Rome see Daremberg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités*, 4.1050ff.; *RE* IV.2247.

probae: equivalent to *pudicae*; cf. Terence, *Adelph.* 930; Horace, *Epod.* 17.40.

25.3. **discerneres:** past potential; cf. 61.1, *BJ* 60.4.

lubido adcensa: *adcensa* to be taken as adjectival and the verb *erat* to be supplied.

25.4. **creditum:** cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.2.6 *neque creditum condonare*; a word which does not occur in Cicero and Caesar, but is common in Livy, e.g. 6.15.5.

praeceps abierat: a combination of two well-known phrases, *praeceps ire*, "to fall headlong" and *abire*, "to stray from the right path". It is a combination used also by Livy, 41.10.5.

25.5. **verum ingenium eius haud absurdum:** as with Catiline —*ingenio malo pravoque*—Sempronia had the advantages of birth and intellect. Tacitus also uses *haud absurdum* with *ingenium*, e.g. *Hist.* 3.62.2; *Ann.* 13.45.3.

posse: a descriptive infinitive, used together with an imperfect; see Introd. p. 20.

prorsus multae facetiae multusque lepos inerat: *lepos* (cf. *Thes. LL.* 6.40) contains the idea of *facetiae* and *urbanitas*, the cultivated, sophisticated appreciation of wit and the things of the mind. Present also is the idea which is related to *urbanitas*, viz. *dicacitas*, wit and mockery. On *facetiae* in general see W. J. N. Rudd, *Mnemosyne* 10 (1957) 328ff. This wit and talent were not incompatible with scandalous conduct occasioned by absence of husbands, pride of birth or love of luxury and competition.

P omits *-que* in *multusque*. The anaphora is certainly more Sallustian, and it would be more tempting to insert *-que* than vice-versa.

26.1. **His rebus conparatis C. nihilo minus . . . petebat:** the presence of *nihilo minus* has given rise to a variety of interpretations of S.'s meaning. S. has already committed Catiline to active preparations for armed revolt before the elections of 63. The two lines of action—rebellion and standing for the consulship—are clearly meant to be taken as alternatives. Catiline as chief magistrate could proceed with a Sullan-type legislation of social reforms; but his previous electoral disappointments and the withdrawal of what support he had enjoyed in the past gave little prospect of his being able to champion *publicam miserorum causam* (35.3) and his own ends as a properly constituted magistrate. The alternative preparations he had made enabled him to swing immediately into the more desperate measures of armed rebellion. However, his decision to attempt the first alternative once more was probably taken with hopes of massive support from the *miseri* of all classes.

Other interpretations assume a twofold programme on the part of Catiline (Cortius, Lang, Gerlach) while Kritz suggested that *nihilo minus* refers to his previous failures in consular elections. None of these explanations reconciles the inherent incompatibility of the two modes of attaining his objective. See further on 27.1.

facile se ex voluntate Antonio usurum: both on the grounds of Antonius' character (cf. ch. 14, 21.3) and the fact that outgoing consuls depended to some degree on their successors in office for the expenses, retinue, and military forces with which they were sent to their provinces. On *ex voluntate* see on 12.2 *ex divitiis*.

neque interea quietus ... Ciceroni: a statement of pre-election activity supported by Cicero himself: *quotiens tu me designatum, quotiens vero consulem interficere conatus es* (*in Cat.* 1.15).

26.2. **neque illi tamen ... astutiae deerant:** the narrative, which in the immediately preceding chapters organised itself into an antithetical structure when contrasting Catiline with the other members of the conspiracy, now continues with the antithesis in the contrast between the activity of Catiline and the activity of Cicero. This particular antithesis continues to govern the narrative down to Catiline's departure from Rome (36.3).

The expression *dolus aut astutiae* has been taken by followers of Schwartz's thesis of S.'s partisanship as directed against Cicero. But the narrative goes on to show, without deliberately underlining it, the efficiency of Cicero's measures to protect both Rome and Italy. The facts needed to reveal the energy with which Cicero acted and the correctness of his claim that he led in discovering the conspiracy and punishing the conspirators (*Att.* 12.21.1) are all present in S.'s account. See T. R. S. Broughton, *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 37. *Dolus* is a *vox media* (Gellius, 12.9; Ulpian, *Dig.* 4.3). *Astutia* is not necessarily a word of disapprobation, cf. Val. Max. 7.4.2; *Thes. LL.* 2.986.44; A. La Penna, *Stud. it. fil. class.* 31 (1959) 20. Nevertheless this cannot be viewed as an enthusiastic description; Cicero would hardly have said of himself *nec mihi deerant dolus aut astutiae.*

26.3. **namque a principio ... sibi proderet:** the preceding and the following sentences support the assumption that all that Curius and Fulvia could have communicated to Cicero *a principio consulatus sui* was (a) Catiline's intention to stand in the elections of 63 and his hopes of support from Antonius, (b) various designs

by Catiline against Cicero's life. Cicero's counter-measures are described in the next sentence.

26.4. **pactione provinciae:** Cicero yielded to Antonius his right to the province of Macedonia, taking in exchange Cisalpine Gaul which he later resigned to Q. Metellus Celer (*in Pis.* 5, *Fam.* 5.2; Plutarch, *Cic.* 12.4). The timing of this *pactio* is not made clear in S.'s statement; from the context it could refer to the period just before the elections of 63 or to *a principio consulatus sui* (sec. 3). Other evidence concerning this arrangement is conflicting. On 1st Jan. 63 Cicero announced that, under certain conditions, he would not accept a province (*Leg. Agr.* 1.26; cf. *ib.* 2.103, Plutarch, *Cic.* 12.4). On the other hand (i) Cicero states in *pro Mur.* 49 that Catiline in his canvass in 63 claimed he had the support of Antonius; (ii) in a list of consular speeches given in their time order (*Att.* 2.1.3) a speech in which *provinciam in contione deposui* (cf. *in Pis.* 5) comes sixth, immediately before the first against Catiline; (iii) Cassius Dio, 37.30.3 states that as late as November 63 Antonius was present at a meeting of the conspirators. Hardy, *op. cit.* 47 = 184, overlooking *Leg. Agr.* 1.26, concluded that the *pactio* was made late in October, after Catiline had been declared a public enemy. Rice Holmes, *Rom. Rep.* 1.457f., suggests a more satisfactory interpretation. Cicero, before entering office, let Antonius know that Macedonia would be his on evidence of good behaviour. Antonius in the meantime did not openly break with Catiline but affected to side with him and learned his plans. The formal transference (*Att.* 2.1.3) was made when Antonius ceased to be dangerous.

praesidia amicorum atque clientium: cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.5.

26.5. **Catilinae neque petitio . . . prospere cessere:** on the development of the political situation since the elections of 64, and especially the manifestation of this change in the withdrawal of powerful support from Catiline's candidature, see W. Hoffmann, *Gymnasium* 66 (1959) 459ff.

Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* 3.184 believed that these elections were postponed until October. Neither S. nor Cassius Dio mention a postponement and other evidence suggests a much shorter period of delay. Catiline, incensed at the passing of *lex Tullia de ambitu*, uttered various threats against the state and this, according to Cicero, was the reason why (*factum est*) *senatum consultum referente me ne postero die comitia haberentur, ut de his rebus in senatu agere*

possemus (*pro Mur.* 51). It is more probable, as suggested by Plutarch, *Cic.* 14.2 and Cassius Dio, 37.29.2-3, that Cicero's reasons for having the elections postponed were the reports he had received concerning plots against his life to be carried out during the elections. The summoning of Catiline to explain himself produced no result (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.30; Cassius Dio, *loc. cit.*) and there was no further reason for postponement. On the day of the poll Cicero appeared armed on the Campus Martius and attributed Catiline's defeat in the elections to the indignation aroused among the people at the danger which threatened their consul (*pro. Mur.* 52; Plutarch, *Cic.* 14.5)

consulibus: the plural here and in 27.2 have been taken to mean that Catiline plotted to assassinate Cicero and the *consules designati*, D. Junius Silanus and L. Licinius Murena; in support Wirz quotes Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.11 *proximis comitiis consularibus me consulem in campo et competitores tuos interficere voluisti*. But there is no evidence of any action against the *designati*. Kurfess (*Phil. Woch.* 46 (1927) 1165) maintains that *consulibus* refers to Cicero only: the plural is to be taken as a label for authority in general and he points to similar inaccuracy in technicalities such as *curia*, 32.1 and 43.3. This argument is weakened by the fact that in 29.3 *consuli* is used to indicate the authority of the office. There remains the possibility that Antonius was to be included with Cicero. I believe that this passage and 27.2 refer to both consuls; Antonius would have had to take measures against Catiline if the latter had murdered his colleague and we have just been told (26.4) that Antonius was now committed to the state.

constituit . . . experiri: S. seems to have adopted literally Cicero's statement on the immediacy of Catiline's adoption of a change of plan: *nunc iam aperte rem publicam universam petis* (*in Cat.* 1.12); cf. Cassius Dio, 37.30.1. But see on 32.1-2.

aspera foedaque evenerant: adjectives used for adverbs, in this case possibly for reasons of *variatio*, as he has already used *prospere cessere* above. Cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 41; Sallust, *BJ* 63.1. See on 52.29 n. *prospere cedunt*. For the meaning of *foeda* here as equivalent to *infaustus, infelix* (*Thes. LL.* 6.1000.27) cf. Livy, 3.44.1 8.33.15; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.68.1, *Hist.* 3.56.1.

Chs. 27-36.3: *The progress of the conspiracy down to the flight of Catiline*

It has been pointed out above (p. 67) that S. thinks and writes in terms of cause and effect and does not necessarily give uniformity to a description of events by strict adherence to sequence of time and place. His attempt to delineate events by showing their effect upon each other invariably entails the omission of unimportant details and sometimes leads to a change in strict chronology if such change will the more effectively show the working of such influential forces. This method must be borne in mind when points of omission or displacement are discussed in the notes which follow.

Artistically, this section is difficult in that S. has to show two lines of events—activity on the part of Catiline and resistance by the government. Complication enters when the activity of the conspirators breaks up into moves carried out in two places, Rome and Etruria. A unifying factor for each major line of action is the person of Catiline and of Cicero respectively. Landmarks which govern the narrative as a whole are the decision on rebellion (27), the *senatus consultum ultimum*, and the first countermeasure of the Senate (29-30), the meeting at which Catiline is unmasked (31) and the flight of Catiline (32).

27.1. **Igitur C. Manlium . . . sibi fore credebat:** the social and economic crisis which had expressed itself at regular intervals in violence, especially in the countryside, is discussed more fully under ch. 33. Outbreaks of violence not only in Etruria (28.4) but in Cisalpina, Picenum, Umbria, the Paelignian land, Campania, Apulia, Bruttium are connected by the sources with Catiline's programme of reform. The probability that most or all of these were originally independent outbreaks has been referred to under 24.2. Cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.6, *pro Sulla*, 53, *pro Sest.* 9; Sallust, *BC* 36.1, 42.1; Plutarch, *Cic.* 10.3, 14.1; Appian, *BC* 2.2; Cassius Dio, 37.30.4, 37.31.2; Orosius, 6.6.5-7.

C. Manlium Faesulas: the *Manliana castra* became the centre of the conspiracy outside Rome and the rallying point for armed rebellion. The statement here, however, implies (a) that Catiline embarked on an alternative plan of armed rebellion immediately after his defeat at the consular elections in 63 and (b) that Manlius began to take orders from him from this time. Other passages do not support this assumption, e.g. 24.2 (Manlius already at Faesulae), 29.1, 33.4-5, 34.2.

Septimium: nothing further is known of this man—*RE* IIA. 1560(1). See on 17.4 n. *domi nobiles.*

Camertem: a native of Camerinum, a town of Umbria, near Picenum. Cf. Cicero, *pro Sulla,* 53.

C. Iulium: may be the C. Julius who was *legatus* to Antonius Creticus in operations against the Cretan pirates in 72. See *RE* X.110(21).

ubique: see on 21.1 *quid ubique.* Another writer would probably have used *ubi quemque.*

27.2. **interea Romae . . . neque labore fatigari:** a passage which presents familiar features of Sallustian style when he is summarising a scene of multifarious activity or deep emotion (cf. 31.1-3)—a sequence of historic infinitives and parts of sentences arranged in chiastic order; see Introd. p. 19.

consulibus: i.e. Cicero and Antonius, who had declared for the state (26.4).

obsidere: 3rd conj. "to take possession of", as in 45.2 for variation and because S. prefers the rarer word.

cum telo esse: cf. 49.4, 50.2; Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.15. The phrase is adapted from a law of the Twelve Tables, by which it was forbidden to wear a weapon in the city, cf. Cicero, *pro Mil.* 11. The prohibition was repeated by a law of Pompeius during the year of his sole consulship, 52 B.C.

item alios iubere, hortari: *alios* used for *ceteros,* as perhaps in 43.3, *aliis* for *ceteris*; cf. *BJ* 100.4 and often in *Bell. Jug.* It is a usage common in Livy, but not found in Cicero. All editors read *iubere, hortari* implying that what is meant is *iubere cum telo esse.* It is tempting to read *iubere hortari* as one expression, so that there would be only one colon after *item.*

festinare: S. uses *festinare* (cf. 42.2) in conformity with Cato's definition (44.4J) *qui unum quicquid mature transigit, is properat; qui multa simul incipit, neque perficit, is festinat.* S. has clarified this meaning by his use of the preceding *multa simul moliri.*

fatigari: such a use of a passive historic infinitive occurs twice in *Bell. Cat.* (cf. 10.6), more often in *Bell. Jug.* It is a feature of S.'s widening of the usage; see Introd. p. 20.

27.3. **postremo . . . principes convocat per M. Porcium Laecam:** S.'s placing of this meeting before the *senatus consultum ultimum* described in ch. 29 has aroused comment as to the writer's intention. This is discussed under 29.1.

From other sources we know that the meeting in Laeca's house took place in November. The date, though disputed, seems to be clearly indicated by Cicero, *pro Sulla* 52 (cf. *in Cat.* 1.8) as the night of November 6: *ad M. Laecam nocte ea quae consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium.* M. Gelzer, *RE* IIA.1706, VIIA.877 takes this to be Nov. 5. He rejects the statements in *pro Sulla* and in Sallust and accepts R. A. Lange's explanation (*Römische Alterthümer*, Berlin, 1871, III, 249) of *proxima . . . superiore nocte* of *in Cat.* 1.1 (cf. *ibid.* 2.6), viz. that the meeting was extended over two days, Nov. 5-6. The precise date is important because it also influences opinion as to the date of the murder attempt against Cicero and of the delivery of Cicero's *First Catilinarian.* The latter point is discussed under 31.6.

multa agitanti: Cicero talks of Catiline's plan to seize Praeneste (*in Cat.* 1.8) and Capua (*pro Sest.* 9).

intempesta nocte: "in the dead of night". It means literally "timeless" night, the period of complete darkness when there is no obvious indication of time, the period between *vesper* and *iubar.* Macrobius, *Saturn.* 1.3.15 defines *intempesta nox* as *quae non habet idoneum tempus rebus gerendis* (cf. Varro, *LL* 6.7, 7.72). Servius, *ad Aen.* 3.587 states *nox intempesta dicta est media, intempestiva, inactuosa* etc. Probably an archaic expression, cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 102, 167V.

per M. Porcium Laecam: cf. 17.3. Jordan, in support of *per* of the MSS, quotes 44.1. The meaning is sufficient as it stands. Others, feeling that S. should have stated the well-known fact that the meaning was held at Laeca's house, have attempted to emend *per.* Thus Dietsch adopts *penes,* the correction of Paulmier. This assumes that *penes* is a precise equivalent for *apud,* which is extremely doubtful, despite Terence, *Adelph.* 388 or Sallust, *BC* 20.8. Wirz remarks that *ibique* points to *ad* instead of *per,* but *ibi* need mean no more than "at that meeting".

27.4. **paraverat:** the indicative indicates S.'s own comment, not C.'s statement.

si prius: unusual for *postquam* (but see Cicero, *2Verr.* 3.40), perhaps on the analogy of *ni prius,* which seems to be more common.

eum . . . officere: for the parataxis see Introd. p. 14f. and 8.1 n. *ea.*

28.1. **igitur perterritis:** see 6.4 n. *metu perculsi.*

C. Cornelius eques . . . L. Vargunteius senator: the identity of these would-be assassins is confused in the sources. C. Cornelius (cf. 17.4) was certainly one, cf. Cicero, *pro Sulla* 18, 52. Other sourches, Plutarch, *Cic.* 16.1 and Appian, *BC* 2.3 are apparently mistaken; both confuse C. Cornelius with C. Cornelius Cethegus when they mention Cethegus as one of the two. Appian gives Lentulus, Plutarch gives Marcius as the other. See C. Buresch, *Commentatio phil. f. Ribbeck*, Leipzig, 1888, 232; Münzer, *RE* IV.1255(19), 1278(89). Cicero's version, so far as the status of the would-be assassins is concerned, is also different: he speaks of *duo equites Romani* in *in Cat.* 1.9. J. Linderski, *Historia* 12 (1963) 511f. defends the Ciceronian expression as the more correct from a legal standpoint.

ea nocte paulo post: this statement, together with Cicero, *pro Sulla* 52, *in Cat.* 1.9, fixes the date of the intended murder as the morning of Nov. 7. Some, however, put the attempt on Nov. 8, e.g. J. Carcopino, *Histoire romaine*, II (1931) 642; A. La Penna, *Stud. it. fil. class.* 31 (1959) 20. Cf. H. C. Nutting, *TAPhA* (1904) lxxxiiiff.

cum armatis hominibus: other authorities say nothing of this feature. Dietsch marks a lacuna after *hominibus*, a missing explanation of the need for armed men. They may have formed a bodyguard for the assassins; Cicero's precautions were certainly on an elaborate scale (*in Cat.* 1.10).

sicuti: used as equivalent to *quasi* or *tamquam si* with a conditional sense, cf. 31.5, 37.5, 38.3, 53.5. It is a usage almost confined to S. See also 16.3 n. *insontis sicuti sontis*.

salutatum: the morning *salutatio* by clients and others occurred very early. Virgil says simply *mane salutantum* (*Geo.* 2.462) but Juvenal, 5.22 (cf. 3.127) states *sideribus dubiis aut illo tempore*; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 1.18.1, *Fam.* 7.28.2, 9.20.3.

domi suae: cf. 21.4, 28.1 where *suus* also refers to the object.

28.3. **ita illi . . . frustra susceperant:** cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.10 *exclusi eos quos tu ad me salutatum mane miseras . . .*

ianua prohibiti: cf. Gellius, 16.5.8f. for an explanation of the *vestibulum* and the method of entry into a Roman house of this type.

28.4. **Interea Manlius . . . nihil relicui fecerant:** S. here summarises social, political and economic factors which form the crucial background to the revolutionary movements and aspira-

tions of these decades. Etruria had suffered especially for its adherence to the Marian party and together with Samnium and Lucania had been chief victim of confiscations of land on which over one hundred thousand Sullan veterans had been settled; cf. Florus, 2.9.22ff.; Cicero, *Att.* 1.19.4. Etruria had risen against the Senate immediately after Sulla's death in the movement led by Lepidus (Florus, 2.11). The background to this turbulence was a social crisis which found expression in a series of agrarian reforms initiated by the Gracchi and attempted at regular intervals down to the land laws of Augustus. The failure or inadequacy of these measures, the indifference of the ruling classes to the misery of both urban and rural poor provided a continuing and increasing store of resentment against the Republican system, and an armoury of support for anyone sufficiently organised and disciplined to use it effectively. The Gracchi, Saturninus, Lepidus and Catiline had lacked the necessary organisation and authority to use it; but men of this depressed class, with arms in their hands and ably led, were the essential instruments in the final downfall of the Republic. For a brief but full treatment of the rural economy of the late Republic see P. A. Brunt, *JRS* 52 (1962) 69ff.

plebem ... novarum rerum cupidam: cf. 37.1, 48.1, *BJ* 19.1, 66.2. The phrase *res novae* may have formed part of the traditional vocabulary of historiography (cf. Livy, 23.14.7) but it was particularly prevalent in the late Republic; cf. Cicero, *2Verr.* 1.19, *Rab. perd.* 33, *pro Sest.* 104, *Att.* 9.12.3; *BG* 1.18.3; Florus, 2.11.2.

sollicitare: regularly used by S. to convey the idea of inciting people to action, e.g. 24.4, 36.1, 39.6, 50.1, *BJ* 19.1.

latrones cuiusque generis: see on 24.3.

ex Sullanis coloniis: cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.20 for an extended statement concerning this element.

nihil relicui fecerant: see on 11.7. The above description of Catiline's following is closely echoed by Cicero's statement concerning Catiline's supporters at the elections of 63: *Catilinam interea alacrem atque laetum, stipatum choro iuventutis, vallatum indicibus atque sicariis, inflatum cum spe militum tum collegae mei, quem ad modum dicebat ipse, promissis, circumfluentem colonorum Arretinorum et Faesulanorum exercitu; quam turbam dissimillimo ex genere distinguebant homines perculsi Sullani temporis calamitate.* (*pro Mur.* 49).

29.1. **Ea cum Ciceroni . . . rumoribus exagitatam:** the date of promulgation of the *senatus consultum ultimum* which resulted from Cicero's report to the Senate is certified as October 21 (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.4, 7; cf. Asconius, 6C). One of the chief charges against S.'s accuracy is that he puts the Senate's decree (Oct. 21) subsequent to the failed assassination (Nov. 7). A variety of explanations have been offered, aimed at exculpating S. on artistic grounds—thus W. A. Baehrens, *NWzA* 4 (1926) 43; O. Seel, *Sallust* etc. Leipzig, 1930, 62f.; W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, 190; K. Vretska, *Hermes* 72 (1937) 207; L. O. Sangiacomo, *Sallustio*, Florence, 1954, 118f. These have all attempted to counter the wide assent given to Schwartz's thesis that S. is eager at any cost to malign Cicero and is here trying to show that Cicero's personal fears, consequent upon the assassination attempt, caused him to ask for the *senatus consultum ultimum*. There is no need for exculpation; S.'s narrative explains Cicero's conduct without doing him discredit. The words *ea cum Ciceroni nuntiarentur* refer only to the unrest in Etruria (28.4). It has already been stated in 28.2 that Cicero had been informed of the murder plot and his counter action was described. Büchner, however, 294, cf. 425, maintains that *privato consilio* must refer to the murder attempt. But since *privato consilio* is connected with *urbem ab insidiis* it simply means that Cicero no longer felt that the conspiracy could be contained merely by watchfulness on his part; the still undefined threat from Etruria and elsewhere demanded stronger official counter-measures.

ancipiti malo: "dangers within and without the city". Cf. Caesar, *BC* 3.72.2 *ancipitem terrorem intra extraque munitiones.*

privato consilio: Cicero had relied up to this point on informers and the help of friends. Further powers were required to authorise military countermeasures.

longius: the only place where S. uses *longius* in a temporal sense. Elsewhere he uses *diutius* (e.g. 39.4, 58.6) and *amplius* occurs in *BJ* 25.10, *Hist.* 3.48.17M. *Longius* is often used thus by Caesar.

neque . . . satis conpertum habebat: this expression has been assumed to be a sneer at Cicero, meant to recall his famous *comperisse omnia* (*Fam.* 5.5.2, *Att.* 1.14.5). But this is a simple statement of the actual situation. Cf. *pro Sulla* 14 and see on 22.3. On *foret*, equivalent to *esset*, see on 14.7 n. *conpertum foret.*

S.'s account of the content of Cicero's report to the Senate, which does not seem sufficiently definite to have occasioned a senatorial decree, has given rise to the conjecture that he has here telescoped two emergency meetings of the Senate into one (Hardy, *The Cat. Consp. in its Context*, 1924, 54ff.). To S.'s account should be added the reports of Plutarch, *Cic.* 15, *Crass.* 13 and Cassius Dio, 37.31.1, viz. that Crassus, accompanied by other Senators, went to Cicero's house by night and brought a number of letters addressed to leading men which had been mysteriously left at his house. Crassus had opened the one addressed to himself and found it to contain an unsigned warning of an impending massacre being prepared by Catiline. The crucial point of information which spurred the Senate to action is indicated by Cicero himself (*in Cat.* 1.7), viz. his foreknowledge that Manlius intended to start armed insurrection on Oct. 27.

exagitatam: elsewhere, e.g. 14.3, 38.1, 48.5, 51.32, S. uses *exagitatus* in its more normal sense of "incite", "excite". This passage requires that *exagitatus* should be given the fairly rare meaning "discussed", "canvassed" as in Cicero, *post Red. in Sen.* 20; cf. *Thes. LL.* 5.1154.55). For this reason Nipperdey (*Rh. Mus.* 1874, 204) proposed *agitatam*. Cortius' emendation to *exagitatum* to agree with *senatum* was adopted by Dietsch and commended by Kritz. It assumes strong feeling on the part of the Senate and this is by no means supported by Cato's strictures in ch. 52. *Exagitatam*, an extremely strong transmission, makes admirable sense here.

29.2. **in atroci negotio:** "in a dangerous emergency". Cf. Caesar, *BC* 1.5.3 *quo nisi paene in ipso urbis incendio atque in desperatione omnium salutis sceleratorum audacia nunquam ante descensum est.*

solet: used absolutely for *fieri solet*; see on 22.2 n. *consuevit.*

decrevit, darent: elsewhere, e.g. 30.7, 36.3, 47.3, S. uses *ut* after *decernere*; its omission here is clearly because the words of the decree are being echoed. In *BJ* 102.2 he omits *ut* after *petere*, and seems to be the only writer to have done so. The omission of *ut* after *hortari* (e.g. *BJ* 54.1, 56.2) occurs also in Caesar and Tacitus.

29.3. **ea potestas . . . consuli ius est:** this forms the fullest account of the provisions of the *senatus consultum ultimum* which we possess. The wording of the decree has come down to us in

three forms, with discrepancies which may be due to carelessness in citing. Willems, *Le Sénat*, 2.247-57 thinks that the correct formula is that used by Cicero in referring to the events of 121 B.C.: *censuerunt uti L. Opimius consul rem publicam defenderet* (*Phil.* 8.14); for the other form see Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.4: *ut L. Opimius consul videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet.* From this evidence it is likely that the full formula was: *ut consules rem publicam defendant operamque dent ne quid res publica detrimenti capiat.* The title *s.c.u.* is not found before Caesar (*BC* 1.5).

The *senatus consultum ultimum* was a statement by the Senate that the state was in danger and that unusual methods for its protection were therefore justified; it implied that a hostile attitude towards the state had been adopted by certain citizens and that these should be treated as *hostes*. A subsequent specific statement that named people *contra rem publicam fecerunt* and were thereby *hostes* (e.g. 36.2) was only the elaboration of an element already present in the *s.c.u.* Cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 3.1242ff.; H. Last, *C.A.H.* IX.87ff.; Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas*. 55ff. G. Plaumann, *Klio* 13 (1913) 344 holds a contrary view, viz. that the *s.c.u.* and the declaration as *hostes* were independent measures.

For a discussion of the powers conferred by the *s.c.u.* and where the responsibility lies for action taken under the provisions of this decree, see Appendix VI.

ea potestas . . . maxuma permittitur: Caesar, *BC* 1.5.3 calls it *illud extremum atque ultimum senatus consultum.* On the term *potestas* see 12.1, 20.8 nn. *potentia.*

more Romano: this emergency measure probably had its origin in the powers conferred on Opimius in 121 B.C. In earlier times the appointment of a dictator was the constitutional method of dealing with a political crisis, but this fell into disuse after the Second Punic War. On the limits of dictatorial power see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 2.164; Plaumann, *op. cit.* 353; P. F. Girard, *Organisation judiciaire des Romains*, 1.233 nn. 2 and 3. It is sometimes claimed, on the basis of such passages as Livy, 3.4.9, 4.13.11, 6.19.3, that the *s.c.u.* was the revival of an ancient right; more probably, however, such statements were inventions by post-Gracchan annalists to provide a pedigree for the powers conferred in 121. See Ogilvie on Livy, 3.4.9 and the lit. cited there.

magistratui: *consules, praetores, tribuni plebis quique pro consulibus* are included in the formula given by Caesar, *BC* 1.5.3.

parare . . . gerere . . . coercere . . . habere: epexegetic infinitives explaining *potestas maxuma.*

exercitum parare . . . socios atque civis: these powers were normally the result of the declaration of a *tumultus* (cf. 30.3) and this, as with the declaration as *hostes* noted above, is held by some to be distinct from the powers conferred by the *s.c.u.* Yet the *s.c.u.* by its terms seems normally to imply the declaration of a *tumultus* if the emergency warrants it.

domi militiaeque . . . summum habere: the conferring of *iudicium summum* would involve suspension of *lex Porcia* and *lex Sempronia* which enforced *ius provocationis*, the right of appeal to the popular assembly through the tribunes, the latter law stating: *ne de capite civium Romanorum iniussu populi iudicaretur.* See further on ch. 55.

It is quite clear that S., despite his alleged party-bias, had no doubts about the legality of this final decree; nor had that leading *popularis*, Caesar (*BC* 1.7.5). It also seems probable that the opposition of the *populares* to the decree, which they themselves used against Sulla in 83 B.C., was largely based on what they conceived to be abuses of the powers conferred by the decree. Thus the trial of Rabirius in the first half of 63 was a popularist challenge concerning the extent to which extraordinary action could be taken against citizens under the authority of the ultimate decree: see Cicero, *pro Rab. passim*; Th. N. Mitchell, *Historia* 20 (1971) 51ff. The question of civic rights is also the basic tenet in Caesar's argument against the imposition of the death penalty in ch. 51.

aliter . . . nullius . . . ius est: the meaning would seem to be: "except in the case of the Senate using its prerogative to issue the ultimate decree, the consul has no *ius* to do any of these things except by order of the people". This leads to the assumption that S. believed that in an emergency the Senate could constitutionally confer all these powers *sine iussu populi.* Although some of the powers mentioned, i.e. *exercitum parare, coercere . . . socios,* form part of the normal *imperium* of the consul, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 3.1244 considered the passage *ea potestas . . . consuli ius est* to be a genuine statement of the powers conferred by the *s.c.u.*; Willems, *Le Sénat* 2.252 n. 6 believed it to be an interpolation, but his reasons for this judgement are not compelling.

consuli: the singular indicates the office, not the holders of the consulship. Cf. Livy, 3.9.5; see 26.5 n. *consulibus.*

30.1. **Post paucos dies L. Saenius . . . recitavit:** Cicero states (*in Cat.* 1.7) that he both knew the date of the outbreak of armed rebellion in advance and told the Senate so on Oct. 21. He omits all mention of Saenius, and S.'s detail here may well be a contribution to accuracy in the record of events.

ante diem VI Kal. Nov.: i.e. October 27.

30.2. **arma portari:** see on *portabant*, 6.5.

Capuae atque in Apulia servile bellum moveri: we learn later (46.3) that Lentulus had given Caeparius the mission of stirring up slaves in Apulia. See on *servitia* in 24.4. On the matter of slave participation in the revolt see on 56.5.

30.3. **igitur senati decreto:** i.e. a *tumultus* was now declared; this enabled positive military measures to be taken. The majority of the codices read *senatus*. *Senati* is supported by Nonius (777.16L) and the testimony of *Schol. Bemb.* Terence, *Eun.* 237. The genitive *senati* appears five times in Kurfess' text (30.3, 36.5, 53.1, *BJ* 25.11, 40.1). In the three instances in *Bell. Cat.* it occurs only in the formula *senati decretum* and has, besides the authority of P, that of the grammarians in its favour; cf. Donatus on Terence, *Andr.* 365, *Hecyr.* 356; Priscian, 2.258.6K; Charisius, 1.22.18K *et al.* In 53.1, two lines above *senati decretum*, S. writes *senatus magna pars*; compare also *BJ* 25.11 with *BJ* 21.4. If a preposition is used the form *senatus* appears, e.g. 42.3 51.36, *BJ* 28.3. The form *senati* in this particular formula is thus to be reckoned among S.'s archaisms. *Senati consulto* is twice cited by a grammarian from Sisenna (*HRR* frr. 17, 119) and is also used by Plautus, *Cas.* 536, *Epid.* 189. It is a form also common in inscriptions; this may betoken a pseudo-archaism, cf. Quintilian, 1.6.27. See further Neue-Wagener, 537ff.

Q. Marcius Rex: consul in 68 with L. Caecilius Metellus; proconsul in Cilicia 67; superseded by Pompeius in 66, saluted as Imperator and demanded a triumph. In 63 he was still waiting outside Rome for permission to celebrate his triumph; there is no mention in the sources that he ever received one. He died before May 15, 61 (Cicero, *Att.* 1.16.10). The Marcii Reges held that their *cognomen* was proof that a king Ancius Marcius did reign at Rome; Ogilvie (Livy, 1.32) regards this testimony as worthless: the *cognomen* Rex was adopted by descendants of M. Marcius, the first plebeian *rex sacrorum* (Livy, 27.6.16). See *RE* XIV.1583 (92).

Q. Metellus Creticus: consul in 69, a member of the great house of the Caecilii Metelli which held six consulships in a period of fifteen years towards the end of the 2nd century, and five in the 60s and 50s. For the stemma of the Metelli see R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 1939, Table 1. An indication of the maze of relationships governed by factors of *amicitia* and *clientela* in Rome is the fact that the elder son of M. Licinius Crassus married a daughter of Creticus (*ILS* 881). As proconsul Metellus reduced the island of Crete and brought it under Roman sway, hence the cognomen Creticus. After waiting for four years for permission, he enjoyed a triumph for this success in 62 (Livy, *Epit.* 99; Vell. Pat. 2.34). Florus is therefore wrong in stating that Metellus gained no other recompense than the mere honour of a cognomen (1.42.6). See *RE* III.1210(87).

circumque: *circum*, a preposition after the verb of motion.

30.4. **hi utrique:** see Introd. p. 16 on the plural of *uterque* when the two things referred to are singular, perhaps a colloquialism.

ad urbem: cf. Pseudo-Asconius on Cicero, *2Verr.* 2.17; Seneca, *Benef.* 5.15.5. No magistrate could enter the city without forfeiting his *imperium*, unless by special decree. Generals who claimed a triumph had to wait outside the walls until the Senate had decided on their application; cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 3.8.1; Caesar, *BG* 6.1.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.19.3. Marcius Rex and Metellus Creticus could be used in this emergency precisely because they still had *imperium.*

inpediti . . . calumnia paucorum: not the ruling clique but some supporters of Pompeius who was opposing each of these triumphs. Lucullus also, whom Pompeius had superseded for the war against Mithridates, did not celebrate his triumph until 63. The feeling behind Lucullus' statement that Pompeius was a carrion bird that feasts upon prey slain by others (Plutarch, *Pomp.* 31.6) was no doubt shared by Marcius and Metellus. For the term *calumnia* see Priscian (2.506.7f. K) who derives it from the supine of the old verb *calvo* "to thwart" "deceive" and hence *calumnia* has a primary meaning of "unfair practices". Cf. Nonius, 10, 21L; Gaius, *Inst.* 4.178.

quibus omnia . . . vendere mos erat: a favourite dictum of S., e.g. *BJ* 31.12, 80.5 and cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.38.4. In *Hist.* 1.18, 4.46M S. constructs *mos est* with *ut.* Kritz explains the infinitive as depending on *quibus mos erat* = *qui solebant.* Both constructions with *mos* occur in Plautus, e.g. *Amph.* 46, *Capt.* 985. For

the polar expression *honesta atque inhonesta* see Introd. p. 16.

30.5. **Pompeius Rufus:** is to be distinguished from his namesake, the tribune of the plebs in 52 who made himself conspicuous (Asconius, 32C) as a turbulent partisan of Pompeius, who became sole consul in that year. Our Rufus, the praetor of 63, went to Africa as proconsul in 61. Cicero, who praises the moderation and integrity of this praetor, gives the impression that he was sent to Capua somewhat later than S. reports here, to succeed Sestius (*pro Sest.* 9). See *RE* XXI.2253(42).

Q. Metellus Celer: another member of the Caecilii Metelli. The name Celer was borne by a Metellus before him, by whom he was probably adopted; Plutarch, *Rom.* 10 has a more fanciful account of the origin of this cognomen. Celer served as a legate under Pompeius, as did his brother, Q. Metellus Nepos who was sent back by Pompeius to be tribune in 62 to protect his interests. Celer governed Gallia Cisalpina after Cicero relinquished his claim to it in 62. Plutarch, *Cic.* 16 says that he was made commander-in-chief in the field against Catiline, and Cicero's language (*Fam.* 5.2.1) is in harmony with this. Cf. also *pro Sest.* 130, *in Cat.* 2.26, *pro Cael.* 59.

There is some evidence, but not conclusive proof, that Q. Metellus Celer was urban praetor in 63 (*RE* III.1208(86); Cicero, *pro Sulla* 65; Val. Max. 7.7.7). If he was urban praetor he must bear a large share of the blame for the resentment among the dispossessed which eventually expressed itself in revolt (ch. 33).

iisque permissum: "authority was given", within the framework of the declaration of a *tumultus*. Cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.4, 2.5; Lucan, 1.595.

30.6. **si quis indicavisset de coniuratione:** financial rewards for information leading to the detection of conspiracies was a common practice; cf. Livy, 2.5.9, 32.26.14, 39.19.3. In spite of these promised rewards and the later repeated promise of immunity (36.2) no one deserted or informed (36.5), an indication of the desperation and determination of those who saw in Catiline's programme some relief from their wretchedness. There was no desertion until the case of the conspirators became hopeless after the execution of the five leading conspirators in the city (57.1).

The subjunctive *indicavisset*, rendering a future perfect of direct speech, reports the condition laid down at the time of the action

of the main verb (*decrevere*) which must be supplied from *itemque decrevere* in sec. 7.

sestertia centum: for *sestertium centum milia*, 100,000 *sestertii*. One thousand *sestertii* made up a *sestertium*, which was a sum not a coin. When *milia* was omitted its ending was substituted for *-um*, to indicate that the unit was not sesterces but thousands of sesterces. *Centum sestertium* might have been retained but *ducenta sestertium* sounded downright wrong.

30.7. **gladiatoriae familiae:** i.e. troops of gladiators. Gladiators were maintained in schools (*ludi*) under the supervision of a *lanista*, who purchased and trained them. The total number under one *lanista* was called a *familia*. At first gladiatorial schools were composed of captives and slaves, augmented, perhaps, by condemned malefactors. Later, under the empire, even freeborn citizens, induced by the money offered, fought in the arena.

Very often gladiators formed an armed retinue in the service of an individual and there was always the danger of their employment in a riot; cf. 50.1-2, 52.14; Caesar, *BC* 1.14.4. There seems to be an inconsistency in sending gladiators at this time to Capua where there were rumours of servile unrest. S. may, of course, be presenting in summary form a series of moves which took place over an extended period of time.

minores magistratus: the higher magistrates were the consuls, praetors, censors. Lower magistrates, said to possess only *minora auspicia*, were aediles, quaestors, tribunes etc.; cf. Gellius, 13.15. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 1.19 is of the opinion that *minores magistratus* was probably not a fixed but rather a relative title. In this case the *tres viri nocturni* certainly, and probably also the aediles and quaestors would be involved; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.1. Augustus was the first to institute a regular police force (*cohors vigilum*) in Rome.

31.1-3. **Quis rebus permota . . . sibi patriaeque diffidere:** this picture of general confusion and aimless despair, coupled with the scathing portrayal of the plebs in ch. 37 and the note on their unreliability in 48.1, forms the chief material marshalled by Seel and others to combat the claim of Schwartz that *Bell. Cat.* is chiefly an indictment by S., the *popularis*, of the ruling nobility.

31.1. **quis rebus:** see on 18.1 and cf. G. Perl, *F&F* 33 (1959) 56ff.

quae: *constructio ad sensum*; Introd. p. 16.

quae diuturna dies pepererat: a concept of a settled state of

affairs certainly not in accord with the statement of Cicero in January 63: *Ego qualem Kalendis Januariis acceperim rem publicam, Quirites, intellego, plenam sollicitudinis, plenam timoris; in qua nihil erat mali, nihil adversi, quod non boni metuerent, improbi exspectarent; omnia turbulenta consilia contra hunc rei publicae statum et contra vestrum otium partim iniri, partim nobis consulibus designatis inita esse dicebantur; sublata erat de foro fides non ictu aliquo novae calamitatis, sed suspicione ac perturbatione iudiciorum, infirmatione rerum iudicatarum; novae dominationes, extraordinaria non imperia sed regna quaeri putabantur.* (*Leg. Agr.* 2.8). The phrase implies a period of calm for the early months of 63 and is contradicted in 36.4ff., cf. *BJ* 41.5ff. As noted earlier, S.'s habit of generalisation entails omissions and the framing of statements designed to answer the artistic purposes of the moment. Here the principle of antithesis governs his description of what preceded the outbreak of the Catilinarian conspiracy: different details of the same period emerge when his description, as in 36.4ff., is governed by different artistic purposes.

invasit: see on *invasere*, 2.5.

31.2. **festinare trepidare** etc.: see on 27.2.

quoiquam: as a pronoun *quisquam* usually stands alone. As a pronominal adjective it is rare with any noun which does not denote a person; *ullus* is normally used instead. Cf. *BJ* 72.2 where, as here, its use is probably influenced by the presence of *homini* (*mortali*); Cicero, 2*Verr.* 2.17 has *cuiquam generi hominum.*

31.3 **magnitudine:** ablative of cause, explaining *insolitus.*

miserari: to express feelings of pity etc. as distinct from *misereri*, to feel such emotions. Cf. 51.9.

rogitare omnia, <omni rumore> pavere, <adripere omnia> superbia etc.: this version is based on Fronto's citation (v.d.H 105). Most editors have preferred the shorter version of the MSS and have confined themselves to the task of choosing between *rogitare, omnia pavere* (favoured by Kritz, Dietsch, Jordan, Ernout) and *rogitare omnia, pavere.* This minor problem can be resolved; *rogitare* can stand on its own; *pavere*, which would be more feeble on its own, occurs with an accusative once or twice in Livy and often in Tacitus.

The real problems of this passage still remain. Though *rogitare* could stand alone it seems rather lame. We could easily explain the omission of *omni . . . omnia*, but how then do we account for

the survival of *pavere* in S.'s MSS? If S.'s MSS preserve the truth, where does Fronto's material come from? It can hardly be explained away as inaccurate citation. No convincing solution comes to mind, but Fronto's version should not lightly be dismissed.

superbia atque deliciis omissis: cf. *BJ* 41.3 where we learn that *lascivia atque superbia incessere* after the removal of *metus hostilis*.

31.4. **ipse lege Plautia interrogatus erat ab L. Paulo:** the date on which this charge was laid is not clear; the vague pluperfect makes it likely that it was some time before Nov. 8, cf. Cassius Dio, 37.31.3. There is no mention of Paulus in the orations of Cicero and his action is alluded to only once, *in Vat.* 25; cf. *Schol. Bob.* 149St. Catiline's reaction—he gave himself into voluntary custody at the house of a certain M. Metellus after having been turned down by M. Lepidus, Cicero and Metellus Celer; cf. *in Cat.* 1.19; Cassius Dio, 37.32 confuses the two Metelli—confirms that evidence against him of complicity with Manlius or of the murderous designs attributed by Cicero was not strong.

lege Plautia interrogatus: cf. 18.2 for *interrogatus*. The *lex Plautia de vi* which here receives its first mention in history, was the law later put into force against the conspirators who were not executed (Ps. Sallust, *Inv. in Cic.* 3; *Schol. Bob.* 84St.). Cicero, *pro Cael.* 70 associates the latter trials with a *lex Lutatia,* sponsored by the consul of 78, Q. Lutatius Catulus. Mention of this law has given rise to a conflict of views concerning laws *de vi.* Mommsen, *Strafrecht,* 654f.; W. Kunkel *RE* XXIV.747 believed the two laws to be identical; J. N. Hough, *AJP* 51 (1930) 135ff. conjectured that *lex Lutatia* created a special *quaestio,* later replaced by a permanent court under *lex Plautia*; J. Cousin, *Rev. Hist. Droit* (1943) 88ff. believed the two laws were operative simultaneously, covering different offences. For a full treatment and rejection of these views see A. W. Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome,* Oxford, 1972, 109-123 (a summary in E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation,* 225-7). Lintott's conclusion is that *lex Lutatia,* passed in the context of the insurrection of Lepidus, was aimed at *seditio* but nevertheless constituted a *quaestio perpetua*; the *lex Plautia* was a later extension of the law to private offences.

ab L. Paulo: L. Aemilius Paulus, brother of Lepidus the triumvir. He was consul in 50 with C. Claudius Marcellus. Proscribed by the triumvirs, he was allowed to make his escape and passed the rest

of his days unmolested in Miletus on the coast of Ionia (Appian, *BC* 4.37). He is invested with the rhetorical and meaningless description *singulari virtute civis* in *pro Mil.* 24; cf. *Fam.* 15.12, 13.

31.5. **postremo dissimulandi causa** etc.: a comparison of this description with that by Cicero gives some insight into S.'s method and principle of composition. Briefly, we may note that S. omits factual details, such as the time and place of the meeting—the temple of Jupiter Stator (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.33, 2.12); the details of the debate, such as the challenge by Catiline to put the matter to a vote in the Senate (*in Cat.* 1.20). Omissions likewise mark S.'s report of the attitude of the Senate. There is no mention of the shunning of Catiline by the consulars (*in Cat.* 1.16, 2.12); of the uncertainty of the attitude of the majority which was indicated by the silence which first greeted Cicero's question as to whether Catiline should leave the state (*in Cat.* 1.20-21) and which forced the consul to resort to the tactic of having the same question put concerning the respected consular, Q. Lutatius Catulus (Diodorus, 40.5a, on which see Münzer, *RE* XIII.2091). The artistic aim of the writer is shown also by the omission of a report of the dumb-founded silence of Catiline (*in Cat.* 2.13, *Orat.* 129) which is replaced by the arrogant disclaimer of a patrician addressing fellow-patricians, ending with the psychologically and artistically appropriate cry of *ruina extinguam*, uttered at another time and in a different place. The aim is concentration of attention on the main protagonists; material assumed to be known to those acquainted with Senatorial procedure and with the writings of Cicero is not repeated. See K. Latte, *NWzA* 2R.H4, Leipzig, 1935, 36ff.

postremo: see on *postremo* in 14.6. S. is here taking up the strict chronological order of narrative which was interrupted by his description of intervening events introduced by *interea Manlius* at 28.4.

dissimulandi causa aut sui expurgandi: cf. note on *dissimulatio* in 10.5. *Sui expurgandi* is more in keeping with Catiline's reaction, reported above, to the charge brought by Paulus. In spite of Cicero's confident assertions (e.g. *ad mortem te, Catilina, duci iussu consulis iam pridem oportebat—in Cat.* 1.2) it is clear from the *First Catilinarian* that he had no evidence conclusive enough to connect Catiline with the overt hostility of Manlius or the alleged plans for murder and arson in the city. His object was to force Catiline to leave the city (*exire ex urbe iubet consul hos-*

tem—in Cat. 1.13) but even then he was not sure whether the sequel would be exile or a linking up with Manlius. See further on 34.2, 36.1.

sicut: Linker's suggestion *sicubi* ('if in any place') which Ernout accepts here but not in *BJ* 60.4 does not fit in so well with the context. *Sicubi* is nowhere attested in S., who has an obvious liking for *sicut* = *quasi*. See on 28.1 n. *sicuti*.

iurgio: "as if he were just involved in a dispute". *Iurgium* is used in the same sense by Cicero, *pro Cael.* 30; cf. *de Amic.* 78; Vell. Pat. 2.33.2.

in senatum venit: the date of this meeting is a matter of dispute. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.1 refers to two nights: *quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris*. The night of the meeting at Laeca's house is described as *noctem illam superiorem* and *priore nocte* (*ibid.* 9). The chronology established by C. John, *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Suppl. 8 (1876) 782ff., *Philologus* 46 (1888) 650ff., which places the assassination plan on the morning of November 7 and the delivery of the *First Catilinarian* on November 8 has been accepted by most scholars. It is restated by T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, 1.461ff. However, some scholars maintain a different chronology. Thus M. Gelzer puts the meeting at Laeca's house on the night of Nov. 5, the attempted assassination on the morning of Nov. 7 and the oration on Nov. 7 (*RE* VIIA.877).

31.6. **tum M. Tullius ... scriptam edidit:** a major plank in Schwartz's charge of partisanship against S. is his failure to include any of Cicero's orations in the work and his use of this first Ciceronian oration in such a way as to make it responsible for sending Catiline to where he could do more harm (39.4). Both points have long been refuted. J. Tolkiehn, *Phil. Woch.* 45 (1925) 1404-5 destroyed the main point by noting that S. nowhere reports a speech indirectly in summary form. The alternative, in accordance with the principles of ancient historiography, which did not favour the incorporation, *verbatim*, of speeches actually delivered, would be the re-creation of the whole or parts of the Ciceronian speeches. The superfluity of such a procedure is inherent in the words *quam postea scriptam edidit*. Like Livy's decision with regard to Cato's well-known speech on the Rhodians, 45.25.3 (cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.63.3) S. felt that it was useless to repeat or adapt a well-known published document. See W. A. Baehrens, *NWzA* 1R.H4, Leipzig, 1927, 1929^2, 40. The grounds upon which Schwartz argued that

S.'s praise of the *First Catilinarian* was ironical are equally untenable. Chs. 31-32 reveal clearly that more factors than one contributed to Catiline's decision to leave Rome. Moreover, S.'s judgement in 39.4 that either a victory for Catiline or an indecisive battle would have been disastrous for the state is based solely on the analysis of the social and economic situation in Italy which immediately precedes and has no connection with Cicero's speech.

praesentiam eius timens: cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.10 *magno me metu liberabis.* The grounds for Cicero's fear were probably twofold: the possibility of Catiline's being able to persuade the Senate of his innocence; the probability that there were as yet undiscovered supporters of the Catilinarian movement even in the Senate and that violence could break out forthwith.

orationem ... luculentam atque utilem r.p.: refers to the *First Catilinarian,* published in 60 according to Cicero, *Att.* 2.1.3 though this passage has been suspected. Cicero applies the adjective *luculentus* to Cato's speech of Dec. 5 (ch. 52) in *Att.* 12.21.1 where it seems to have the meaning "distinct", "outspoken". Here it carries its ordinary meaning of "brilliant", "splendid". *Utilem rei publicae* is a criterion of worth repeated elsewhere by S. by means of such concepts as *verum* (8.1), *rectum* (1.3), *ius bonumque* (9.1), *bonum publicum* (38.3). As such, it can hardly be viewed as a term of disparagement.

31.7. **sed ubi ille ... inquilinus civis urbis Romae:** the tone of this appeal, the patrician addressing his peers and using the powerful influence of the possession of an old patrician name and the prejudice against the emergence of *novi homines,* is repeated in the letter to Catulus (ch. 35); see the discussion *ad loc.* As noted above, Cicero indicates that no denial came from Catiline. Plutarch, *Cic.* 16 states that Catiline attempted to speak before Cicero rose but was not given a hearing. S. is once again inventing, constructing from material which belonged elsewhere. Both Florus (2.12.7) and Val. Max. (9.11.3) follow S. in reporting a denial by Catiline.

ortum: the only place where S. uses *ortus* with the simple ablative. Elsewhere, e.g. 6.3, 51.27, he uses *ex.* Cicero's construction with *ab* is not used.

beneficia: the earliest Sergius we hear of was decemvir in 450 (Livy, 3.35.11, see Ogilvie *ad loc.*; Broughton, *MRR* 1.46). L. Sergius Fidenas was twice consul and tribune with consular powers three times (*MRR* 1.58). A Cn. Sergius was tribune with

consular powers three times between 387 and 380 B.C. (*MRR* 1.99). The most distinguished was M. Sergius Silius, highly eulogised by Pliny, *NH* 7.104 for his exploits in the 2nd Punic War.

in plebem Romanam: a strong transmission, but a strange boast in such company. The earliest MSS may have had simply the abbreviation *p.r.* and the conjectures *in populum Romanum* (Gruter) and *in rem publicam* (Cortius) are both attractive.

inquilinus civis: like *peregrinus, vicinus, inquilinus* is primarily and adjective, secondarily a noun. It could be taken as standing in apposition to *civis* here; cf. *BJ* 12.5 *mulieris ancillae. Inquilinus,* "lodger", "sojourner", implying that Cicero was hardly a Roman citizen in spite of the fact that his native Arpinum had long possessed citizenship rights, formed part of the traditional phraseology of political abuse. It was probably not used on this occasion by Catiline. Appian, *BC* 2.2 mentions *inquilinus* (ἰγκουϊλῖνος) as a catch-phrase of the general reaction against Cicero, the *novus homo*; cf. *pro Sulla* 22. It may have been used in the reply to Cicero's *Tog. Cand.* as Asconius 93C reports: *huic orationi Ciceronis et Catilina et Antonius contumeliose responderunt, quod solum poterant, invecti in novitatem eius* etc.

31.8. **parricidam:** the original meaning of this word eludes us. Popular Roman etymology derived *parricida* from *patricida,* the slaying of close relatives, and *parricida* was used to denote enormity of crime. Thus, as here, it is often applied to the crime of treason. Cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 2.31, *in Cat.* 1.29; Sallust, *BC* 14.3, 51.25, 52.31; Livy, 3.50.5; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.85.3; see Wackernagel, *Gnomon* 6 (1930) 17ff.; Gernet, *RPh.* 63 (1937) 13ff.; Leroy, *Latomus* 6 (1947) 17ff.; Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étym.* (s.v.).

31.9. **circumventus:** a word often used for the idea of being ensnared and oppressed by the wiles of wicked men; cf. 16.3, 34.2; Cicero, *Off.* 2.51; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.13.3.

incendium meum ruina extinguam: this statement was actually made in a meeting before the consular elections in 63. Catiline's retort to a threat of prosecution from Cato was, as reported by Cicero (*pro Mur.* 51) *si quod esset in suas fortunas incendium excitatum, id se non aqua sed ruina restincturum.*

32.1-2 **ibi multa . . . volvens . . . ad urbem adcessurum:** cf. 27.4. S. could be writing *ex eventu* here; he presents Catiline, before he left Rome, as having fully planned a second stage of revolution—armed revolt after joining Manlius to be synchronised

with disturbances in the city. Cicero is not so sure; he constantly brings in the idea of exile when considering Catiline's next move (cf. *in Cat.* 1.23, 2.12-14); he talks of Catiline's joining Manlius in hypothetical terms (e.g. *ibid.* 1.30: *si . . . pervenerit*). He thinks he knows what Catiline will do but cannot be certain until the latter makes his decision: *ille autem si mehercule hoc quod agit nunquam antea cogitasset, tamen latrocinantem se interfici mallet quam exsulem vivere* (*ibid.* 2.16). See on 27.1 n. *Manlium*, 32.3, 34.2, 44.5.

32.1. **ex curia:** used loosely; the Senate had met in the temple of Jupiter Stator, not in the Curia Hostilia (*in Cat.* 1.1, 33). For the phrase *ex curia proripuit* cf. Cicero, *Har. Resp.* 1.2; Livy, 3.17.1, 8.30.11 *et al.*; Suetonius, *Aug.* 54.

volvens: the use of the present participle in an aoristic sense (cf. *BJ* 35.10, 113.1) probably owes something to the influence of Greek. Cf. Bennett, 1.435; Marouzeau, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 16 (1910) 133ff.; Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 48 (1913) 259 n. 2; Kroll on Catullus, 64.238.

insidiae consuli procedebant: similar datives occur at 32.2, 40.2 (*tantis malis*), 40.3 (*miseriis suis*); these are to be explained as imitations of the old Latin dative which was used after nouns which had a clear verbal meaning. See Bennett, 2.184ff. who gives an example of *insidiae* from Accius; cf. L-H-S, 91.

exercitum augere: on *augere* see 6.3 n. *res . . . aucta.*

antecapere: see on 13.3.

nocte intempesta: an Ennian phrase, used also by Cicero. See on 27.3.

cum paucis: confirmed by Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.4, cf. 1.4. According to Plutarch, *Cic.* 16 Catiline marched out with 300 men well armed and with the *fasces* and other signs of authority. Appian, *BC* 2.3 states that he assumed proconsular dignity while en route; Cassius Dio reports him, after reaching Faesulae, to have assumed the title and the badges of consulship (37.33). See on 36.1.

32.2. **mandat quibus rebus possent opes factionis confirment** etc.: historians show a tendency to use primary subjunctives after a past or historic present main verb in order to retain some of the original values of tense or mood obscured under the Ciceronian convention of secondary sequence. Here, with a variation of tenses dependent on a historic present, the imperfect (*possent*) represents an indicative of *oratio recta* in contrast with the im-

peratival present subjunctives; cf. 34.1. See further M. Andrewes, *CR* n.s. 1 (1951) 142ff.

opes factionis: see on 20.4. S. uses *factio* often in *Bell. Jug.* for the *pauci potentes*. Its occurrence in *Bell. Cat.* (e.g. 34.2, 51.40, 54.6) is much in the same sense, that of a closed clique, but not necessarily confined to the Optimates; cf. Cicero, *de Rep.* 3.23. On *factio* see L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics*, 9ff.; R. Seager, *JRS* 62 (1972) 58ff.

propediem: *prope diem*, "shortly". Originated from the parenthesis *prope est dies*; with the omission of *est* the accusative was expected after *prope*—hence *propediem*. Cf. Wackernagel, 1.59.

32.3. **ex suo numero:** equivalent to *ex numero suorum*. Cf. *BJ* 35.6.

huiusce modi: cf. 20.1. This phrase clearly implies that the letter which follows is not an exact duplicate of an actual letter. This impression is strengthened by the incorporation of phrases which are clearly Sallustian in origin, e.g. *imperium . . . quarum rerum causa bella atque certamina omnia inter mortalis sunt; libertatem quam nemo nisi cum anima simul amittit* (33.4). The artistic advantage of the epistolary form (cf. ch. 35, the letter of Pompeius, *Hist.* 2.98, of Mithridates, *Hist.* 4.69M) is that S. is enabled to vary his narrative method. The relative frequency of letters in the extant works probably also indicates a desire on his part to impart an air of historical research and veracity to the work. On this letter, with its offer to surrender if their grievances were met, as the probable statement of a dissident movement originally independent of Catiline, see on 24.2 n. *Manlium*.

33.1. **Deos hominesque . . . atque praetoris fuit:** the emphasis on the social and economic ills of the period reiterates the fact that Catiline's programme of cancellation of debts and redistribution of land was dictated by more than mere demagogism; it was based on the harsh realities of a situation which secured for Catiline a wide and varied following, especially among *agrestis homines tenuis atque egentis* (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.20). Fighting and devastation in the 80s and again in 78-77 (Diodorus, 38.24; Florus, 2.6.11, 2.9.22, 27-8; Appian, *BC* 1.51.86; Orosius, 5.18.25-6), the continuous unrest in the countryside thereafter, the great slave revolt of 73-1 (Sallust, *Hist.* 3.98M; Florus, 2.8.5, 10; Appian, *BC* 1.117), the indirect effects of pirate depredations and the Mithridatic War had led to a social and economic crisis. According to

Cicero (*Off.* 2.84) the burden of debt was at its height in 63 and a bill had been proposed, but not passed, at the beginning of the year for the cancellation of debts (Cassius Dio, 37.25.4). The oppressed would include not only nobles impoverished by the expenditure of running for office or by the squandering of their patrimonies (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.18), but a more serious and enduring situation could arise from a series of bad harvests which forced yeomen to borrow and tenants to default in their rent. The harsh laws of debt would leave the latter at the mercy of their creditors who could keep them in custody and perhaps even make them work as bondsmen. It is not surprising that revolution spread to all parts of Italy (36.5, 52.15), nor that Catiline was assured of a faithful following to the end. It is this real and continuously recurring background of indebtedness (37.4-9; Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.17-23) which has given rise to attempts to portray Catiline as a genuine social reformer, blocked, as were the Gracchi before him, by the selfish solidarity of the threatened aristocratic and equestrian possessors of power and money. For such attempts to rehabilitate Catiline, which should be treated with caution, see, e.g. B. L. Ullman, *CJ* 30 (1935) 385ff.; S. L. Mohler, *Cl. Weekly* 29 (1936) 81ff.; W. Allen Jr., *CJ* 34 (1938) 70ff. The general economic background of the period is discussed by T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore, 1933, 1.300ff. and in particular by P. A. Brunt, *JRS* 52 (1962) 69ff.; Z. Yavetz, *Historia* 11 (1962) 486ff.

neque quo periculum . . . sed uti: see Introd. p. 19 on *quo* without a comparative and cf. 11.5 n. *quo sibi fidum faceret.* For the variation *quo . . . uti* cf. 34.2, 58.3. For the phrase *periculum facere* cf. *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.7.1; Tacitus, *Ann.* 13, 33.3, 16.19.3.

qui miseri . . . expertes sumus: for the harsh attitude inherent in Roman law to those who did not uphold their word or maintain a contract cf. Polybius, 6.58, 15.4.10; Gellius, 20.1.39-42. See F. Schulz, *Principles of Roman Law*, Oxford, 1936, 223ff.

For members of the higher social classes inability to pay a debt involved (a) *proscriptio bonorum*—the auctioning of their property and the distribution of the proceeds to the creditors—and (b) *infamia*—a formal banning from the Senate, magistracies and law-courts—political death. Cf. Cicero, *pro Quinct.* 30; *Lex Julia Municip.* 116 (Bruns, *Fontes*[2], 108); Gaius, 4.102; O. Lenel, *Das Edictum Perpetuum*[3], Leipzig, 1927, 79, 413ff.; Greenidge,

278ff.; *RE* VIA.56f.; S. Solazzi, *Il concorso dei creditori nel diritto romano* I, Napoli, 1937, 36ff.

At a lower social level the sanctions of Roman law against the insolvent debtor were very harsh. In primitive times it seems that a creditor could seize, enslave and finally even kill a debtor as if he were a criminal. Much of the agitation which marked the struggle of the Orders was concerned with harsh laws of debt; the 4th cent. is a period of frequent legislation on debts, the most notable triumph of the poor being the introduction of *lex Poetelia Papiria*, referred to below. For treatments of the topic of debt see *CAH* VII.542ff.; Ogilvie, 296ff.; M. W. Frederiksen, *JRS* 56 (1966) 128ff.

crudelitate faeneratorum: an expression with several parallels in Livy, e.g. 6.14.3, 8.28.1, 5. On *faeneratores* see Cicero, *Fam.* 5.6.2, *Off.* 2.84; Horace, *Epod.* 2.67.

plerique patriae sed omnes fama atque fortunis expertes: so Kurfess with some of the more important codices. A double construction with *expertes* is paralleled by other changes of case in S., e.g. *BJ* 74.3 (gen. and abl. with *potiti*), 84.2. Plautus also uses this double construction with *expers*; thus genitive, *Amph.* 170, *Pseud.* 498; ablative, *Amph.* 713, *Pers.* 509. But *plerique patriae sed omnes* is a harsh conjunction. I prefer to accept, with Ernout, Weinhold's conjecture *patria sede*: "most of us have been deprived of our native home, all of us of our good name and possessions". *Patria expertes* refers to debtors who escaped the consequences of indebtedness by flight or voluntary exile. For *fama atque fortunis* cf. 51.12, *Hist.* 2.47.5M, and Introd. p. 18.

lege uti: the law referred to here was most probably the *lex Poetelia Papiria* of 326 B.C. (Livy, 8.28.8) by which imprisonment for debt was forbidden. Before this, if Gellius, 20.1.19 has rightly interpreted the Law of the Twelve Tables, the creditor had power not only to confine his debtor but to have him put to death; cf. Livy, 6.34.2.

saevitia faeneratorum atque praetoris: the introduction of the praetorian system of jurisdiction had made forms of foreclosure more lenient, but a debtor could still be given over to the creditor in temporary bondage (*addictio*) to work off his debt (*lex Rubria* 22 = Bruns, *Fontes*[7], 100; Quintilian, 5.10.60; Brunt, *JRS* 48 (1958) 168). Manlius' complaint indicates that the laws against usury were generally ignored by the ruling and monied classes.

The cruelty and oppression of the rich on their debtors had caused many of the disturbances that had interfered with the early growth of Rome, cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 1.11M. In the time of Horace money could fetch as much as 5% per month (*Sat.* 1.2.14) and the 48% interest which the upright M. Brutus tried to extort from the Salaminians is a notorious example (Cicero, *Att.* 5.21.11). Manlius' statement may be tinged with rhetorical exaggeration but there is no doubt of the widespread misery caused by debt and the difficulty of combating the influence exercised over the *praetor urbanus* by the group who could afford to lend money.

praetoris: cf. note on Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, 30.5. The *praetor urbanus* was the principal judge in all civil processes and by his *edictio* at the beginning of the year of office he revealed to all the regulations by which he would conduct his *jurisdictio.* The room for favour and influence which such a system offered was naturally considerable; cf. Greenidge, 97. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.32, 2.5 makes reference to the troubles caused by the praetor's administration in 63; Livy, *Epit.* 74 and Appian, *BC* 1.54 report the murder by usurers of the praetor of 89 because he ventured *secundum debitores ius dicere.* On the legal points raised by Manlius see further Greenidge, 278f.; P. F. Girard, *Manuel Elementaire de Droit Romaine*[5], Paris, 1911, 1044ff.

33.2. **vostrum:** the MSS have *vestri* or *nostri*; *vestrum* has the support only of Gellius, 20.6.14. Since Manlius was a member of a patrician family he would undoubtedly have said *nostri.*

opitulati sunt: a colloquial word (cf. Plautus, *Miles* 621), frequently used in Cicero's letters. Help was provided by legislation and other means such as the free distribution of corn or a lowering of the price, e.g. the *lex Sempronia frumentaria* (Livy, *Epit.* 60). Specific legislation included the *lex Licinia-Sextia* of 367 B.C. (Livy, 6.35.4, 6.39.2) which allowed interest already paid to be deducted from the capital sum. In 296 B.C. usurers were heavily fined by the tribune. The *lex Flaminia minus solvendi* of 217, by raising the nominal value of the denarius, enabled debtors to pay off their debts by partial payment.

novissume: cf. *BJ* 10.2, 19.7. Varro, *LL* 6.59 objected to this word *nimium novum verbum quod esset* and Cicero uses it very rarely. Gellius, 10.21, noting that L. Aelius Stilo avoided using it because it was *novum et improbum verbum,* implies that the influence of Cato, e.g. 89.24J, and of S. gave it currency.

omnibus bonis: see on 19.2 n. *boni.*

argentum aere solutum: this may refer to the *lex Valeria,* promulgated by L. Valerius Flaccus in 86 B.C. (Vell. Pat. 2.23.2) *qua creditoribus quadrantem solvi iusserat,* i.e. one quarter of the debt was to be accepted as payment in full. The bronze *as* was worth one quarter of the silver sesterce. This law is also mentioned by Cicero, *pro Font.* 1 and seems to be referred to in *pro Quinct.* 17. Mommsen, *Münzwesen,* 383 seems to accept this interpretation of S.'s phrase, but Mattingly, *Roman Coins*², 89 (cf. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.,* 1925, 21ff.) believes that it refers to the compulsory circulation of debased coinage.

33.3. **saepe . . . secessit:** *saepe* used rhetorically to correspond with the preceding *saepe.* In fact three secessions are recorded in Roman history. The first, in 484 B.C., on account of the severity of creditors, was made to the Mons Sacer (Livy, 2.32); the second, caused by the conduct of the decemvir, Appius Claudius, was made first to the Aventine, later to the Mons Sacer (Livy, 3.50) in 449; the third, to the Janiculum in 287 as the result of a dispute over public lands (Livy, *Epit.* 11). Each led to legislation in favour of the dissatisfied plebs. S. refers to the second secession in *BJ* 31.17. On the historicity of these *secessiones* see Ogilvie on Livy, 2.32 and 3.50 and the lit. cited there.

plebs: an elastic term in a political context and one favoured by S. to designate the non-noble element in the state. The form *plebs* occurs again in 48.1, *BJ* 63.6, 65.5; *plebes* in 37.1, 4, *BJ* 33.3, 40.3, 66.4.

aut dominandi studio aut . . . magistratuum: S., as usual, restricts his treatment of historical facts to the immediate needs of his narrative. In his idealised sketch of Roman history (chs. 6-9) he made no mention of *secessiones.* Now he motivates the historical fact of *secessio* by the two features most apposite to his immediate purpose, the relevant concepts of *dominatio* and *superbia magistratuum.*

33.4. **at nos non imperium . . . simul amittit:** there is a significant negation of wealth and *dominatio* as goals of the movement, in contrast to the programme outlined by Catiline himself (20.14, 58.9). *Libertas* here is simply the opportunity to be relieved from the oppression of the magistrate and the moneylender. Such a contrast in protestations gives strength to the supposition, mentioned above, that the movement led by Manlius orig-

inally started for its own reasons and with a defined objective.

quarum rerum etc.: epigrammatic expressions which are Sallustian and part of the language of historiography; cf. Livy, 2.15.3. Sallustian also is the doublet *bella atque certamina* (Introd. p. 18).

cum anima simul amittit: a rhetorical *topos;* cf. *BJ* 14.23; *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.10.7, 2.13.2. *Amitto* = "let go" brings out the required meaning and spirit of the epigram.

33.5. **te atque senatum . . . consulatis . . . neve nobis . . . inponatis:** see on 51.7 n. *providendum est* etc. Cf. a letter of Lepidus to the Senate, Cicero, *Fam.* 10.35.2.

quonam modo: as Wirz remarks, belongs rather to *ulti* which is logically the principal verb: "how in the struggle for life or death we may sell our blood as dearly as possible".

34.1. **respondit . . . vellent . . . discedant . . . proficiscantur:** on the variation of tenses see note on 32.2. The imperfect subjunctive represents a present of *oratio recta* and the present subjunctives are retained to reflect their imperatival force as it appeared in the direct speech.

petiverit: after consecutive *ut* and reflecting the perfect of direct speech.

ea mansuetudine etc.: does not correspond with the facts of earlier or even contemporary history. A case in point is that of the Allobroges who found fault with the Senate *quod in eo auxili nihil esset* (40.3) and Cicero's report (*in Cat.* 2.8) that the oppressed throughout Italy saw in Catiline, not in the Senate, a refuge and a hope, a report which contradicts his later description of the Senate (*in Cat.* 4.2) as *summum auxilium omnium gentium.* On *mansuetudine atque misericordia,* with which compare 52.11, see Introd. p. 18.

34.2. **ex itinere . . . litteras mittit** etc.: the claims in these letters may truly reflect what Catiline thought at the time of writing. As we have seen, Cicero's accusations still lacked the basis of conclusive evidence; in particular, the claim that he was going into exile in Massilia would be absolutely pointless if it were false at the time it was made—a few days would expose him as a liar. That he thought of the possibility of rebellion goes without saying (cf. 36.1) but from the statements here it seems that exile figured more prominently in his thoughts when he was leaving Rome. The letter to Catulus (ch. 35) is in keeping with this impression. See R. Seager, *Historia* 22 (1973) 247.

optumo quoique: equivalent to *nobilissumo quoique ex optimatibus* (Wirz).

falsis criminibus circumventum: cf. Livy's description of an earlier demagogue (4.21.4) *falsis criminibus a Minucio circumventum Maelium arguens.*

nequiverit: perfect subjunctive accompanied by imperfects. See on 32.2. The perfect may be designed to represent a perfect indic. in *oratio recta.* Cf. *BJ* 15.1.

fortunae: see on 10.1 n. *saevire fortuna.*

Massiliam: the modern Marseilles, founded by the Phocaeans (Thuc. 1.13.6) about 600 B.C. The Romans formed an alliance with Massilia and allowed it to retain a nominal independence and sovereignty over a small area on the coast. It became a common place of refuge for Romans condemned to exile or forced into voluntary exile. Thus Verres fled to Marseilles during the course of his trial for extortion and Milo took refuge there after the murder of Clodius.

non quo . . . conscius . . . sed uti: on *quo . . . uti* see on 33.1. For *sibi conscius* cf. *BJ* 40.2, *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.6.4.

oreretur: the majority of codices have the more usual form *oriretur. Oreretur* is found at *BJ* 72.1 but *oriretur* at *BJ* 6.3. Neue-Wagener, 3.253 states: "the poets of the Augustan age use neither *oriretur* nor *oreretur.* In the MSS of the prose writers, and especially in the more accurate ones, *oreretur* and *orerentur* are so common that they must be accepted as equally correct as *oriretur* and *orirentur*".

34.3. **Q. Catulus:** consul in 78, censor in 65 with Crassus. The most illustrious member of the oligarchical party both in rank and reputation. A leading opponent of the conferment of extraordinary command on Pompeius (Cicero, *de imp. Cn. Pomp.* 59; Sallust, *Hist.* 5.23M), he was also prominent in the opposition to the rise of Caesar (Sallust, *BC* 49; Vell. Pat. 2.43.3). See *RE* XIII. 2082(8). Cassius Dio, 43.24.4 gives the impression that the murder of Marius Gratidianus by Catiline during the Sullan terror was in the nature of a ritual sacrifice carried out at the grave of Q. Lutatius Catulus, victor of Vercellae, as an expiation for the death of that hero. This might suggest an early and lasting relationship between Catiline and the son of Lutatius Catulus.

earum exemplum: an introductory formula also used for a letter of Lentulus to Catiline (44.4) which is undoubtedly genuine

and can be checked against Cicero's version (*in Cat.* 3.12). S.'s substantial accuracy in reporting Lentulus' letter makes it probable that he is here also dealing with a genuine document. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that the letter is couched in a style which is not Sallustian and contains a number of words and phrases not found elsewhere in S.—*honestare, satisfactio, commendatio, commendare, conscientia de culpa, medius fidius, statum dignitatis non obtinebam.* See Earl, 94; Syme, 72 n. 53. The contents of the letter, which gives reasons for Catiline's decision different from those already proposed by S., are also an argument for its genuineness, cf. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, *Über die Reden u. Briefe bei Sallust,* Leipzig, 1881, 25f.

35.1. **egregia tua fides . . . commendationi meae tribuit:** "your outstanding integrity, known to me by experience, pleasing to me in my great trials, has inspired me with confidence in recommending my concerns to you".

re cognita: *cognita* is nominative, agreeing with *fides.* Catiline has benefited from the patronage of Catulus who successfully testified in his favour in the case of the Vestal Virgins (15.1); cf. Asconius, 91C; Orosius, 6.3.1.

magnis in meis: Kunze (*Sallustiana,* III.2.17ff.) notes that the placing of the preposition between adjectives is foreign to Sallustian usage.

fiduciam . . . tribuit: on the basis of Sallust, *Hist.* 2.111M *fiducia* is sometimes interpreted as *audacia*; cf. Servius auct. *ad Aen.* 2.61; Nonius 484L. *Fiducia* is a *vox media* and is to be distinguished from *confidentia* which is *in malis rebus* (Isidorus, *Diff.* 1.217). But cf. Donatus on Terence, *Andr.* 876; Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.132. In this context it can only mean *fides.*

35.2. **defensionem . . . satisfactionem:** *defensio* signifies a formal defence in the presence of accusers; *satisfactio* denotes a general explanation, a justification of conduct one might make to a friend.

in novo consilio: could be a euphemism for *res novas moliri*; but equally well it could simply be a reference to his intention to go into exile.

conscientia de culpa: *de culpa,* a rarer and probably colloquial usage for objective genitive. The normal Sallustian phrasing occurs in 5.7 *conscientia scelerum, BJ* 27.3, *Hist.* 1.77.7M. The preposition here may be used, as in Cicero, *Att.* 2.24.3 *iis de rebus*

conscium esse Pisonem to suggest a less definite connection between *culpa* and *conscientia* than would be the case, e.g. with *ex*.

me dius fidius: the assimilation of Hercules to Semo Sancus Dius Fidius, the native Italic god of good faith (Dion. Hal. 4.58.4; Ovid, *Fasti* 6.213-8) has been made both in ancient and in modern times. The authority of Varro (Aelius Stilo) *LL* 5.66; Propertius, 4.9.71; Festus 254, 276L for the identification has been accepted by Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Mythologie*[3], Berlin, 1881-3, 2.281; J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain*, Paris, 1926 believes the assimilation to be justified to a certain degree. The oaths, *me dius fidius* and *mehercule*, may be a factor in this popular identification of Semo Sancus with Herculus. More recent scholarship seems on the whole to be against the assimilation. See H. J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Mythology[5], London, 333 n. 91.

licet cognoscas: such a use of the subjunctive is foreign to S.'s own style. He normally uses *licet* with the infinitive, e.g. 3.1, 13.2, 33.1, 36.2 *et al.*

35.3. **iniuriis contumeliisque . . . laboris industriaeque:** doublets, such as S. often uses. See Introd. p. 18.

statum dignitatis: a reference no doubt to his electoral defeats, cf. *relicuae dignitatis* in sec. 4. But the concept of *dignitas* covered a wide field. For the meaning of the term adequate literary evidence exists only from the late Republic, when, politically, it signifies either a particular office or the prestige acquired through holding office. See H. Wegehaupt, *Die Bedeutung u. Anwendung von dignitas in den Schriften der republikanischen Zeit*, Diss. Breslau, 1932, 22f. *Dignitas* attached to a man permanently and was inherited by his descendants and as such was closely allied to *nobilitas*—both rested ultimately on the tenure of public offices. *Dignitas*, like *nobilitas*, became identified with the distinction and preserves of the nobility; hence Catiline's tone in addressing the greatest living representative of this exclusiveness is strongly reminiscent of his remarks concerning Cicero in the Senate, 31.4ff. It is an element which persists, since S. reports that Catiline died *memor generis atque pristinae suae dignitatis* (60.7). However, *dignitas* went through the same process of perversion of meaning as other elements of the political vocabulary in the late decades of the Republic. *Potentia* and *dignitas* are key concepts in the formation of the First Triumvirate (Florus, 2, 3.11; Cassius Dio, 37.55.3-56.4); in the relationship between Pompeius and

Caesar (Florus, 2.13.4) and in the outbreak of the Civil War (Florus, *ibid.*; Lucan, 1.125; Caesar, *BC* 1.4; Vell. Pat. 2.33.3). When a basically individual desire is raised to the proportions of a political problem (*publicam miserorum causam* . . . *suscepi*) and an individual claim to justice is looked upon as a criterion of what is right and wrong, such a line of thinking must inevitably lead to revolution. See further Earl, 53ff.; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960) 43ff.

non obtinebam: "I have not maintained the state of *dignitas* to which my birth entitles me since I have failed to attain the *honores* which are my birthright". His use of *privatus* underlines the immediate defeat—*quia consul non sum factus.*

publicam miserorum causam: Catiline explains that his failure in the elections of 64 (*statum dignitatis non obtinebam*) caused him to put forward a programme of reform in his canvass during 63. Cicero, *pro Mur.* 50 speaks of a *contio domestica* by Catiline prior to the elections of 63 in which he proclaimed himself *dux et signifer calamitosorum.* For Catiline's phrase here cf. the claim made by an earlier leader of the people (Herdonius) *se miserrimi cuiusque suscepisse causam,* Livy, 3.15.9, cf. 7.41.1.

pro mea consuetudine: so, e.g. Cicero, *pro Arch.* 32; S. normally uses *ex consuetudine,* e.g. *BJ* 71.4, 85.9.

non quin . . . non possem: codices also present *qui* and *quia* with the subjunctive of rejected reason. Some editors who accept *quin* maintain that the negative before *possem* must be omitted. The repetition of the negative is a colloquial usage, since the negative in *quin* was considered not clearly obvious. Cf. Cicero, *in Pis.* 3, *Fam.* 2.17.5; L-H-S, 678. The whole statement contradicts the impression given by 5.7, ch. 20 and Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.14.

meis nominibus . . . alienis nominibus: ablatives absolute acting as attributes to *aes alienum*; the various debts contracted both in his own name and in those of his friends; cf. 24.2.

non dignos homines: certainly includes Cicero who had headed the polls in the elections; cf. 31.7.

honore honestatos: on *figura etymologica* see Introd. p. 18. Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 247, 356; Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.20. The alliteration also serves to underline the writer's feelings. See on 7.6 n. *facinus faceret.*

alienatum: "rejected". *Alienare* meaning *alienum reddere et e familia eiicere.* Cf. Terence, *Heaut.* 979.

35.4. **hoc nomine:** *nomen* is sometimes used in epistolary style for *causa*; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 6.2.3 *is multis nominibus . . . Graecos in eo reprehendit quod mare tantum secuti sint. Nomen* can also mean "pretext" as in 38.3.

satis honestas . . . spes: like *in novo consilio* above, an ambiguous expression, and could refer either to exile or to armed rebellion. The ambiguity may reflect Catiline's uncertainty as to what decision he should arrive at.

casu: explained by *fructus laboris . . . privatus*; cf. *BJ* 62.9, 73.1.

35.5. **vim:** presumably a reference to the activity of Cicero prior to Catiline's departure (cf. *in Cat.* 1.24). Cicero later expresses the uncertainty which still haunts him as to Catiline's intentions; if the conspirator turns away from the plans of war which the consul states (*ibid.* 2.15) is his ultimate design Catiline *indemnatus innocens in exsilium eiectus a consule vi et minis esse dicetur.* (*ibid.* 2.14).

35.6. **defendas:** jussive or hortative subjunctive, common with 1st and 3rd person, rare with 2nd where the imperative or a periphrasis is more normal. The unusual form here is engendered by the vague idea of asking in *rogatus*; *defendas* is less peremptory than *defende.*

per liberos: could mean *ut liberos tuos salvos vis*, or may imply some form of connection between them and Catiline.

haveto: a formal expression of greeting. The word is treated as though from a verb *aveo*, though it exists only in imperative and present infinitive forms. It is used as a form of salutation both at meeting and parting. It occurs at the beginning of a letter by Augustus (Gellius, 15.7.3). It is sometimes distinguished from *vale* which is used as an evening greeting (Suetonius, *Galb.* 4.4); in Martial *avere* is distinguished, as a greeting to the living, from *valere*, a greeting to the dead (9.7.4; cf. Catullus, 101.10). On the form *haveto* see Quintilian, 1.6.21.

36.1. **C. Flaminium:** receives only this mention. Undoubtedly, like Manlius, he was a Sullan veteran who expected much from the movement of Catiline; cf. 24.2, 27.1.

Arretino: the majority of codices read *Reatino*; since the *ager Reatinus* is far more often mentioned in literature the intrusion of *Reatino* for *Arretino* is understandable. From a factual point of view *Reatino* is unlikely to be correct since Reate was a Sabine town and Catiline was proceeding along the Aurelian Way (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.24, 2.6).

cum fascibus etc.: in addition to the twelve lictors with their *fasces* which contained the axe (*securis*), there were the curule chair (*sella curulis*), the military cloak (*paludamentum*) and the sword (*pugio*). Cf. Suetonius, *Galb.* 11.

If there is validity in the view that Catiline, on his departure from Rome, had not arrived at a final decision as to his future action, a view which I believe cannot lightly be dismissed, we may have here the occassion when his mind was made up. The meeting with his adherents at Forum Aurelium (*in Cat.* 1.24), probable prolonged discussion with Flaminius at Arretium led to the resolve to join Manlius at Faesulae. The decision is marked by the adoption of the insignia of consulship; cf. 32.1 n. *cum paucis* and the differences in the reports of the sources on the timing of this assumption of consular trappings.

36.2. **hostis:** "public enemies"; the final weapon of the Senate against rebellious citizens by which they were considered to be at war with the state and were deprived of all citizen rights. The term for a foreign enemy was originally *perduellis* (Cicero, *Off.* 3.107). Cicero explains the term *hostis* (originally = stranger) in *Off.* 1.37; cf. Varro, *LL* 5.3. Definite action by Catiline is now met by definite action on the part of the Senate.

ceterae multitudini: did not include, presumably, the named conspirators of 17.3f., 43.1.

sine fraude: an old formula found in the Twelve Tables for "without guilt" (*sine damno*) which was used in this sense by later writers, e.g. Cicero, *Phil.* 8.33; Livy, 1.24.5, 26.12.5; Caesar, *BG* 5.51.3 has *sine periculo* as an equivalent. Cf. Ulpian, *Dig.* 50.16.131 (*poena*). *Sine fraude* can have the active meaning *sincere, vere*; cf. Caesar, *BC* 2.22.1.

praeter . . . condemnatis: *condemnatis* depends on *liceret*; *praeter* is adverbial (*praeterquam*); cf. Gellius, 1.23.13; Suetonius, *Claud.* 4.7, *Nero* 56; Justin, 13.5.2.

36.4-39.5. *Description of the current political situation in Rome*

In this discussion of the contemporary political situation, S. continues with and brings up to date his earlier picture of Rome (chs. 11-13); his description is governed by a repetition of the ideas which controlled earlier accounts, viz. the rise of prosperity which is responsible for a moral decline. However he adds features which are more pressingly relevant to the situation in 63 B.C.

His account of the support given to Catiline differs significantly in one detail from the list given by Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.17-23. S. reports that Catiline's programme was supported by *omnino cuncta plebes*. Cicero, in a speech *habita ad populum*, could hardly have classed his hearers among the murderers, bandits and adulterers he was inveighing against; perhaps he meant to imply that they could not possibly be followers of Catiline. S.'s inclusion of the plebs has inevitably supplied ammunition for the followers of the Schwartz's thesis that he was a partisan writer, representing the conspiracy as a popular rising on the part of the proletariate against the corruption of an aristocratic oligarchy. This basic view is represented by I. Calevo, *Il problema della tendenziosita di Sallustio*, Udine, 1940, 62ff.; for a different viewpoint see W. Steidle, *Historia*, Einzelschr. 3, 1958, 11ff. S. himself supplies the corrective by his treatment of the plebs in chs. 31 and 48.

By his report of the widespread sympathy given to Catiline (36.5, 37.1) S. moves from that part of his theme (*sceleris novitas*) which has played a leading role in his narrative up to this point, to *periculi novitas* which is to be underlined in the rest of the work and which constitutes a leading concept in the great debate between Caesar and Cato in chs. 51-52. This danger shows itself in two major aspects. For the first time it is plainly stated that *res publica* is moving towards an overthrow of the government. Such a contingency is made possible by the degeneration of public morals, an old theme, but now expressed in terms of the debasement of political vocabulary and political activity. The real danger was that political unrest could be seized upon and used for the realisation of individual dreams of *dominatio*. This *periculi novitas* receives an explicit statement in 39.4 *quod si primo proelio . . . libertatem extorqueret*.

36.4. **Ea tempestate . . . perditum irent:** a repetition of the main point of chs. 6-13, prosperity and success destroy the civic virtues. Its clearest expression is in *Hist.* 1.11M: *discordia et avaritia atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala*. The durability of such a view in historiography is indicated by Livy, 22.22.19, 28.24.6, 45.31.4f.

multo maxume: it seems to have been Cicero's rule to use *multo* with comparatives, *longe* with superlatives—an exception occurs in *de imp. Cn. Pomp.* 54: *magna et multo maxima*. S., who rarely uses *longe*, uses it with a comparative in *Hist.* 3.48.9M *longe*

saevior, and with a superlative in *BJ* 9.2 *longe maxuma*. He uses *multo* both with comparatives (e.g. 20.13, *BJ* 54.7, 85.24) and superlatives (e.g. 52.20, *BJ* 6.1, 85.33). See Kühner-Stegmann, 2.463.

ad occasum ab ortu: cf. Quintilian, 9.4.23. S. is not alone in changing the expected order of words. Cf. Horace, *Od.* 4.15.15, *Sat.* 1.1.76; Statius, *Silv.* 3.3.47; *Lucretius*, e.g. 2.12 (*noctes atque dies*) as in Virgil, *Aen.* 6.127 and in Cicero, *de Orat.* 1.260. In many cases such inversion may be accounted for by metrical reasons, while in Horace, *Od.* 4 logic may be the reason.

adfluerent: *adfluo* here is equivalent to *abundo*.

seque remque publicam: see 9.3 and Introd. p. 19.

perditum irent: *ire* with the supine is a strong colloquial phrase, common in comedy, and indicates the intention as well as the action of the agent. It is a favourite of S., e.g. 52.12, *BJ* 31.27. He also uses *properare* with the supine, e.g. *Hist.* 3.48.16M.

36.5. **namque duobus senati decretis:** for practical purposes an ablative absolute. S. probably had an instrumental ablative in mind, but then went on to the specialised construction of *inductus* with the ablative and left his first ablative hanging.

The first decree of the Senate, 30.6; the second, 36.2. On the form *senati* cf. 30.3.

patefecerat: the subject *quisque*, with which *inductus* agrees, follows in the second half of the sentence. Q. Curius is ignored in this context since his disclosures came before offers of impunity in 30.6. On the tense of *patefecerat* see on *transtulerant*, 18.7.

tanta vis morbi . . . invaserat: S. comes close to the basic thought of his later work, the *Histories*, where he attributes deterioration to the failings of human nature, *vitio humani ingenii* (*Hist.* 1.7M); cf. Livy, 6.35.6, 28.23.4. However, elements of social and economic distress also play a part. See nn. ch. 33.

Here he uses a medical metaphor which is continued in the following sentence. This type of metaphor is common in Livy, e.g. 42.5.7: *contagione velut tabes in Perrhaebiam quoque id pervaserat malum*; cf. 24.2.8, 28.29.3, 29.10.3. It probably derives from Greek historiography and popular philosophy where νόσος and νοσεῖν are used for symptoms of political decline. On the form of parataxis used here see Introd. p. 15 and 7.3 n. *tanta cupido gloriae incesserat*.

atque uti: the reading of all MSS; the passage is also quoted

with *uti* by Festus (490L). Elsewhere, e.g. 10.6, *Hist.* 1.77.9M, S. uses *veluti* and *quasi* in this way and at *BJ* 32.4 the identical phrase occurs with *veluti*. I would therefore endorse Haupt's suggestion (*Philologus* 3 (1848) 547) that we should read *ac veluti* here.

37.1. **aliena mens:** *aliena* could have its normal meaning 'estranged', but I believe that the medical metaphor is being continued, involving an extremely rare meaning of *aliena* = 'deranged'. Cf. Lucan, 5.169 *bacchatur demens aliena per antrum / colla ferens*. Livy uses the more usual *alienata mens*, e.g. 42.28.12. See *Oxford Lat. Dict.* s.v. 12.

fuerant: the pluperfect refers to the period before knowledge of the conspiracy became general as a result of the Senatorial decrees. The plebs, when they heard of it, became enthusiastic supporters.

omnino cuncta plebes: Cicero, while omitting the urban plebs, does emphasise that Catiline received much support from the rural plebs (*in Cat.* 2.8, 4.6, *pro Mur.* 78-9). On the form *plebes* see on 33.3 n. *plebs*.

37.2-3. **id adeo . . . habetur sine damno:** S. here points to a feature which was long felt to be a basic factor of all *dissensiones* in Roman history. The plebs was considered to be a real and continuing revolutionary element in the state. For a similar outlook cf. *BJ* 86.3; Cicero, *pro Sest.* 99. It reflects a principle strongly underlined in Greek political theory; cf. Plato, *Rep.* 552d, *Laws*, 738c; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1265b.

37.2. **id adeo:** repeated in 37.11 and occurs several times in S. as a reinforcement (like *ipsum*) for the pronoun, like Greek τοίνυν e.g. *BJ* 65.3, 110.3, 111.1.

37.3. **bonis . . . malos:** see 19.2 n. *boni*. *Boni-mali* here are more than purely ethical terms. *Boni* still retains some of the meaning given it in current political thought, i.e. people with property and therefore devoted to the strengthening of the constitution. *Mali* likewise carries the idea of lack of possessions and lack of principles. Plautus, *Capt.* 583 brings out the idea more or less: *est miserorum ut malevolentes sint atque invideant bonis*.

mutari: the passive infinitive to indicate that the action is not dependent on the subject. The plebs follow a leader; they do not initiate action.

sine cura: "without apprehension".

aluntur: cf. 14.3; equivalent to *vitam tolerabant turba atque seditionibus*; cf. Cicero, *Off.* 2.40; Livy, 33.47.3.

quoniam egestas facile habetur sine damno: explains *sine cura*; *habetur* used in the sense of *toleratur*; the poor have nothing to lose.

37.4. **sed urbana plebes:** *sed* leads from the general feature of the plebs as a constant revolutionary element to the specific *urbana plebes*, which he proceeds to divide into three groups: *primum omnium* (5); *deinde* (6); *praeterea* (7).

The constituents of S.'s *urbana plebes*, particularly the presence of the Sullan veterans, have puzzled some scholars (e.g. Nipperdey, *Rh. Mus.* 33 (1874), 205; L. Herrmann, *REA* 31/32 (1929) 124). We know from other writers that for much of the time between 123 B.C. when C. Gracchus first fixed a cheap price for corn and Clodius' frumentary law of 58 B.C. corn distribution had been suspended or restricted to a few recipients. It was not until 58 that corn was given away. All other evidence for a drift into Rome seems to place it later than 58 (Varro, *RR* 2 pr. 3; Appian, *BC* 2.120; Suetonius, *Aug.* 42.3). See P. A. Brunt, *JRS* 52 (1962) 69f., who also notes other views on this question. It seems, therefore, that S. has here also antedated a movement which became more marked and widespread after 58. By doing so he once again underlines factors of social and economic distress which do much to account for the support given to Catiline. But the motivation attributed to these different sections of the plebs remains typically Sallustian; like all adherents of Catiline they thrive on *malum publicum*.

ea vero: on the parataxis see Introd. p. 14f. and 8.1 n. *ea*.

praeceps erat; i.e. *ad Catilinae incepta probanda*. Cf. *BJ* 6.3: *natura . . . praeceps ad explendam animi cupidinem*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.21.3: *animam ad flagitia praecipitem*.

37.5. **primum . . . item . . . postremo:** on S.'s method of sentence connection see Introd. p. 16. *primum* here is related not to *idem* and *postremo* of the same sentence but to *deinde* of the following.

praestabant: "were conspicuous". *Praestare* is rarely used in a bad sense, as here; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.24.1 *truculentia caeli praestat Germania*. Cicero (*Leg.* 1.51) uses *excellere* in the same way: *qui singulis vitiis excellunt*.

item alii: the meaning is *alii maxime praestabant* and there is

no point in retaining *qui*, even though its MS support is strong.

per dedecora: on S.'s preference for a prepositional phrase in place of an adverb (e.g. *flagitiose* in this case) see Introd. p. 20.

flagitium aut facinus: see on 23.1 and cf. 14.1. Note the alliterative *probro atque petulantia* in the same sentence.

ii: for the parataxis see Introd. p. 14f. and 8.1 n. *ea*.

sicut in sentinam: Cicero is fond of the metaphorical use of *sentina*, the etymology of which is uncertain (Ernout-Meillet, s.v.) and which many take to mean the bottom of a ship, where the bilge-water collects. Cicero uses it in the meaning of "dregs", *in Cat.* 1.12, 2.7, *Leg. agr.* 2.70, *Att.* 1.19.4, as does Livy, 24.29.3. This meaning clings to S.'s use of the word; the people he is describing formed a *colluvies*.

37.6. **multi memores . . . sibi quisque . . . sperabat:** in apposition to a plural subject *quisque* does not normally influence the number of the verb in S., e.g. 38.3. The exception can be accounted for here probably because of the long interval which separates *multi* from the verb.

ex gregariis militibus . . . senatores: sources favourable and unfavourable to Sulla take extreme positions on this point. Appian, *BC* 1.100; Livy, *Epit.* 89 state that he drew only from the equestrian classes; cf. H. Hill, *CQ* 26 (1931) 170ff.; E. Gabba, *Athenaeum* 29 (1951) 262ff. To double the Senate Sulla would have to draw on men of experience, equites, leading municipal figures and the like. S.'s statement, supported by another unfavourable source, Dion. Hal. 5.77.4, is accepted by Willems, *Le sénat*, 1.407 and Carpocino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée*, Paris, 1931, 65.

alios ita divites etc.: from the point of view of the Sullan veterans this could point to such as L. Luscius, a centurion who is said to have amassed property of ten million sesterces during the Sullan period (Asconius 90C; Cassius Dio, 37.10.2; *RE* XIII. 1865(1). For the *urbana plebes* in particular the tangible results in private wealth of the Sullan regime were daily before their eyes: see on 20.11f. and cf. 52.5. That the latter is the more probable reference is indicated by S.'s use of *regio victu* etc., with its undertone of the oppression of the many and the unconstitutional prominence of the few; cf. 5.6, 47.2.

aetatem agerent: see 4.1 n. *aetatem agere*.

37.7. **iuventus:** an extension of Catiline's following among the

iuvenes, by no means limited to members of the nobility; cf. 14.5.

in agris manuum mercede: most free inhabitants outside Rome must have been engaged in agriculture either as landowners, yeomen-farmers, tenants or day-labourers. There is little record of these people even in writers on agriculture such as Cato, Varro and Columella; cf. Brunt, *op. cit.* 71 with notes. Free labourers would be hired mainly for seasonal work and we have no knowledge of how these people subsisted at other times of the year.

privatis atque publicis largitionibus: private largess was bestowed by candidates for popular favour or by those who enjoyed popular support; cf. Plutarch, *Crass.* 12.2, *Sulla* 35.1. Public largess refers to corn distributed below cost price or at a nominal rate. Sulla had put an end to such distributions but the *lex Terentia Cassia* of 73 provided for small distributions to 40,000 recipients (Asconius, 8C), a number increased to about 200,000 by Cato's law of 62. See T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome,* 1.329f. Besides corn, there were occasional distributions of oil or wine (*congiaria*) below cost price (Livy, 25.2.8, 37.57.11).

eos atque alios omnis: *eos* refers to *iuvenes,* the last mentioned group; *alios omnis* gathers in the previously mentioned groups and any others besides.

malum publicum: an expression used by Cato (37.17J) and which occurs in Sisenna (*HRR* fr. III).

37.8. **iuxta . . . consuluisse:** *iuxta,* "as little as". For the adverbial use of *iuxta* cf. 2.8, 61.5. On *consuluisse* cf. 6.6 n. *ingenium sapientia validum.*

37.9-11. **praeterea . . . ad hoc . . . revorterat:** with the groups already mentioned the motivation is clearly based on social and economic distress. S. now deals with other elements for whom political motivation of a particular sort was also present.

37.9. **bona erepta, ius libertatis inminutum:** i.e. by the *lex Cornelia de proscriptione* in 81, which declared that all goods of the proscribed should be confiscated and children of proscribed persons rendered ineligible to hold public office. Cf. Sallust, *Hist.* 1.49M; Vell. Pat. 2.28.3f.; Plutarch, *Sulla,* 31.3ff. Cicero, as consul, defeated an attempt to repeal the law; a fragment of his speech *De Proscriptorum Liberis* is preserved by Quintilian, 11.1.85 and Cicero alludes to his attitude in *in Pis.* 4. He granted that the request was reasonable but argued against it on grounds of state policy. The law was later abrogated by Caesar in 49 (Suetonius, *Jul.* 41; Plutarch, *Caes.* 37.1; Cassius Dio, 41.18.2).

37.10. **partium:** rarely used by S. in a party-political sense; in *BJ* 43.1 he speaks of *populi partes*. Usually he contrasts *plebs* with *nobilitas*, seeing the age-old Roman struggle in terms of social class and economics. His attitude to party labels, indicated by his refusal to use the technical terms *populares* and *optimates*, is clearly shown by his statement in 38.3f.

conturbari rem publicam malebant: a remarkable statement for a writer who, according to Schwartz's view, was a propagandist for the *populares*. On the passive *conturbari* see on *mutari*, 37.3.

37.11. **id ad eo malum . . . revorterat:** *adeo* should be accepted; see on 37.2 *id adeo. malum* refers to the return of party strife, set in train by the restoration of tribunician power. *Multos post annos* is therefore a relative term; it represents a period of eleven years, since tribunician power had been limited only between 82 and 70 B.C.

38.1. **nam postquam . . . potentesque fieri:** also an unusual judgement for an allegedly partisan writer. S. is concerned with the tribunate not as an office but as a means by which *bonum publicum* was subordinated to greed for personal power, cf. *Hist.* 1.12.18M. The same holds good for all official positions. The corruption of political vocabulary to hide the reality of power is a constant theme in S. The concepts *dominatio, servitium, libertas, auctoritas* are twisted to suit the needs of all parties, cf. *Hist.* 1.55M *passim*, 1.77M *passim*. The agitation for restoration of tribunician power is thus viewed simply as one stage in the progressive deterioration of *concordia*.

tribunicia potestas: the main provisions of Sulla's legislation were (a) that anyone who had been tribune was declared ineligible for any other office; (b) tribunes were not allowed to propose any legislative measure to the *concilium plebis* (but cf. *CAH* IX.896 and Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 403 n. 33); (c) were not allowed to hold public meetings of any kind. Although the power of veto was left intact prohibitions against its use in specific cases seem to have been multiplied (Cicero, *Verr.* 1.44, 2*Verr.* 1.155). In the words of Vell. Pat. (2.30.4) the tribunate was reduced to *imago sine re*.

homines adulescentes: see on 3.3 *adulescentulus*. The expression (cf. 52.26, *BJ* 6.2; *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.5.5) has an archaic flavour; see *Thes. LL.* 1.794.84 and cf. *mulier ancilla, BJ* 12.5.

There was no *legitima aetas* for the tribunate; entry to the

Senate via the tribunate could be the aim of young men interested in attaining early membership of the Senatorial order. But both money and backing would be necessary to enable such to forego the quaestorship, an office which normally preceded a tribunate. Caelius Rufus, aged 29 (Pliny, *NH* 7.165) and Asinius Pollio, aged 27 (Tacitus, *Dial.* 34) became tribunes in 52 and 47 respectively. That S. himself had a similar *cursus* is unlikely (Introd. p. 3). See T. P. Wiseman, *New Men*, 99.

potestatem . . . potentesque fieri: brings out clearly the distinction mentioned at 12.1.

senatum criminando: note the recommendation of *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.46 *adversarios criminando benevolentiam captare.* Acquisition of power by this means is mentioned by Livy, referring to Gaius Terentius Varro, 22.34.3, cf. 3.35.3-7.

plebem exagitare: cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.27.2 *tribunis reddita licentia . . . populum agitandi.*

38.2. **contra eos . . . sua magnitudine:** S. makes it clear that degeneration of individual and civic *virtus* was not confined to any one political group or social class. To make his meaning quite clear he takes the trouble to interpret *specie* in sections 3 and 4.

summa ope nitebatur: a phrase common in S., e.g. 1.1, *BJ* 14.20, 25.2, and in Livy, e.g. 4.43.5, 22.34.2.

senatus specie: i.e. *specie pro senatu, re vera pro sua magnitudine.* The meaning is conveyed by *honestis nominibus . . . bonum publicum simulantes . . . certabant* (38.3) and *Hist.* 1.12M *pauci potentes . . . sub honesto patrum aut plebis nomine dominationes adfectabant.*

38.3. **namque uti paucis . . . potentia certabant:** although the topics of debasement of values, perversion of political vocabulary and *dissimulatio* in political activity are fairly common themes, cf. Plato, *Rep.* 560d; Isocrates, *Areop.* 20, *Antid.* 283ff., *Panath.* 130f., Seneca, *Ep.* 45.7, it seems clear from the closeness of parallel in thought and expression in the case of this passage and others of similar content in S. (e.g. 10.3, 52.11, *BJ* 41.5, 42.4) that he was drawing upon Thucydides, 3.82, of which the present passage is almost a translation.

post illa tempora: an indefinite statement: it could refer to the time when the period of renewed tribunician activity began, i.e. *post dominationem Sullae* (5.6, cf. 18.8); but the same features

were applicable to the period before Sulla, cf. *malum . . . in civitatem revorterat*, 37.11 and *BJ* 41.5.

quo: on this use of *quo* = *ut* see Introd. p. 19 and 11.5 n. *quo sibi fidum faceret.*

alii . . . pars: see on *inconcinnitas*, Introd. p. 15.

sicuti: followed by the subjunctive of hypothetical comparison where *sicuti* is equivalent to *quasi*. See on 28.1 n. *sicuti*.

bonum publicum: see 9.1 n. *ius bonumque.*

quisque: used in partitive apposition to a plural antecedent and, as usual, followed by a singular verb.

38.4. **neque illis . . . contentionis erat:** cf. 11.4. *Illis* here refers to members of both parties.

39.1. **bellum maritimum:** supreme command in the war against the pirates was invested in Pompeius by the Gabinian law of 67. Cf. Cicero, *De imp. Cn. Pomp.* 34f.; Vell. Pat. 2.31.32; Florus, 2.41; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 25. S.'s phrase may have been used to avoid repetition of the Ciceronian *bellum piraticum.*

Mithridaticum: the character of Mithridates, king of Pontus, is briefly sketched by Vell. Pat. 2.18. Lucullus had carried on the war against him for nearly seven years and was then recalled by the Senate. Pompeius, having successfully concluded the pirate war, was, by the Manilian law of 66, given supreme command against Mithridates.

plebis opes . . . paucorum potentia: Mommsen observes that the Gabinian and Manilian laws dealt democracy a deadly blow. This is undoubtedly true but what S. is hinting at more positively here, as in 19.2, is that the Senate took advantage of Pompeius' absence to entrench its position at home so that it would have the power to deal with P. on his return. This seems clear both from 38.1 and from the sentence which follows this.

39.2. **ii magistratus . . . placidius tractarent:** cf. 20.8, *BJ* 41.7, *Hist.* 1.55.13M. S. can here apply to a specific historical situation the theoretical causes of destruction of *concordia* he had already discussed, e.g. in 10.3ff.

innoxii: "unmolested", in a fairly rare passive meaning. Cf. Lucretius, 6.394; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.20.1; Columella, 5.9.10, 12.38.8. In 40.6 *innoxius* is used in its more usual active sense "blameless". Other adjectives which are sometimes given a passive meaning in S. are *ignarus, BJ* 18.6, 52.4; *incertus, BJ* 49.5; *falsus, BJ* 10.1.

aetatem agere: see 4.1 n.

ceterosque . . . quo . . . tractarent: thus the MSS, two of them omitting *-que* of *ceterosque*. Scholars have been divided in their interpretation of this passage. Those who believe that *ipsi* (= *pauci*) wanted those magistrates who might be inclined to deal more mildly with the populace to be prevented from doing so by threats of prosecution have suggested emendation of *quo* to convey this meaning. Thus *quom* (Weidner), *quo ne* (Ritschl), *quo minus* (Opitz). Ritschl (*Rh. Mus.*, 1866, 318) preferred Kritz's *qui* for *quo* and altered the order of the text: *ceteros qui plebem in magistratu placidius tractarent iudiciis terrere.* Jordan incorporated Ritschl's conjecture into his 3rd ed., without noting that it is not the MS reading.

S.'s use of *quo* elsewhere (e.g. 11.5, 33.1) is an argument for its retention here and the meaning 'to compel the tribunes to deal more mildly with the people' seems to be more in keeping with the general line of thought. We have just been told that *ii* (i.e. *pauci*) *magistratus . . . tenere*, undoubtedly referring to the majority of the important magistracies. The tribunate they could not so easily control. There is no difficulty involved in including the tribunate in the term *in magistratu* (cf. *BJ* 37.1); *placidius* seems to point to *exagitare* and *incendere* in 38.1 and the use of *plebem* here is a pointer in the same direction.

iudiciis: examples of such intimidation are the cases *de maiestate* against C. Cornelius, trib. 67 (Asconius, 57ff. C; Cassius Dio, 36.38f.) and C. Manilius, trib. 66 (*Schol. Bob.* 119St.; Asconius, 59-60C.). See E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation*, 260ff.

39.3. **sed ubi primum . . . adrexit:** cf. Thucydides, 3.82.7.

dubiis rebus: see 10.2 n. *dubias res*.

novandi: used absolutely, equivalent to the Greek νεωτερίζειν. A fairly rare usage, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.18.2: *si eis quoque legionibus cupido novandi fuisset.*

vetus certamen animos eorum adrexit: refers to *dominationis certamen*, cf. *BJ* 41.2, *Hist.* 1.7M. The following sentence confirms that S. is not referring rather vaguely to the long-standing animosity between plebs and patricians. *Eorum* refers, not to *plebs* (of 39.1 and 2) by synesis, but to *ceteros*, the active opponents of oligarchic privilege, acting in the name of the people but in reality striving for personal aims.

adrexit: "made keen", a form of the verb commonly used by S., e.g. *BJ* 68.4, 84.4, 86.1, 93.7, to be distinguished from *erexit*

which means being revitalised after having been cast down, e.g. Cicero, *pro Cluent.* 58: *erigebat animum iam demissum et oppressum.*

39.4. **quod si primo proelio . . . extorqueret:** here S. is pointing to what for him was the real political significance of the conspiracy, the veritable *novitas periculi* of his theme. The danger lay not in the possibility of Catiline's success but in the excuse it might give for a renewal of political strife, exploited for aims of personal power, military usurpation. The career of Julius Caesar, the facts of contemporary history, namely the outcome of the conspiracy which had resulted in the murder of Caesar and the alignment of Antony and Octavian in the final struggle for supremacy, made plain the danger portended by this earlier conspiracy.

superior aut aequa manu: for the modifying force of *aut* cf. *BJ* 56.5: *cuncti aut magna pars.*

clades atque calamitas: on the alliterative doublet see Introd. p. 18. For the singular *oppressisset* see on 12.1 n. *sequebatur.*

neque illis: hardly applies just to Catiline's party but to the eventual victor. The meaning might have emerged more clearly if S. had written *neque enim illis*, but, as often, S. omits the causal particle which should join two sentences which are causally connected. See on 17.7 n. *quia Cn. Pompeius.*

The same basic thought occurs in Cicero who distinguished this conspiracy from all earlier dissensions in that it did not aim, as the others did, at a correction of government organisation but at its overthrow; cf. *in Cat.* 1.3, 5, 9, 12; 2.10; 3.2; 4.2, 7.

defessis et exanguibus: "completely exhausted".

qui plus posset: a *variatio* for *potentior* which would balance with *defessis* etc. The subjunctive *posset* indicates an indefinite statement, not referring to a specific individual. S. is perhaps pointing to the hopes of such powerful intriguers as Crassus and Caesar, cf. 17.5. A more definite allusion could be presumed, perhaps, to the case of Pompeius who did have specific hopes that the conduct of the final stages of the counter-measures against Catiline might be transferred to him: cf. *Schol. Bob.* 134St.; Cassius Dio, 37.43.1; Plutarch, *Cic.* 23.2.

39.5. **fuere tamen . . . parens necari iussit:** this isolated incident, if indeed it has not been misplaced from 17.5 through scribal error or because of oversight on S.'s part, seems to be connected (*tamen*) with what precedes it. It adds to the extent and nature of Catiline's following: "but quite apart from the

members of the conspiracy there were others who . . .". The contrast between the conduct of the son and the old-fashioned *severitas* of the father could be interpreted as a comment on the degeneration which in S.'s view had caused the crisis.

Fulvius: some editors name this individual A. Fulvius. Val. Max. (5.8.5) calls the father A. Fulvius and Cassius Dio (37.36.4) incorrectly makes the son a Senator.

parens necari iussit: *patria potestas* gave a father *ius vitae necisque* over a son. The *lex Pompeia de parricidiis* (c. 70 B.C.) excluded from the number of people who could be guilty of parricide a father who killed a son. It was not until late in the Empire that this power was withdrawn. Val. Max. (5.8.5) adds the fathers' statement in this case and gives other examples of such severity. See further on *filii familiarum*, 43.2.

39.6-47. *The Allobroges and the Conspiracy*

As before, S. continues his account of the conspiracy by reporting activity both in Rome and outside Rome. The major unifying factor of his narrative from this point is the activity centred around the Allobroges and the different effects which this new feature had both upon the plans of the conspirators and the counter-measures of the government. It is instructive to compare S.'s account of the Allobrogian affair with that of Cicero (*in Cat.* 3).

39.6. **quoscumque . . . idoneos credebat:** this qualification for entry into the conspiracy remains one of the few consistent elements in Catiline's undertaking, cf. ch. 14, 37.3.

per se . . . per alios: a rare example of *concinnitas* in S.; *per se* instead of *ipse* perhaps to emphasise the toal effort to enlist adherents.

quoiusque modi genus: see on 24.3 *plurumos quoiusque generis*. Lentulus, who advocates slave disturbances (46.3) seems to have had less compunction than Catiline as to the composition of their support. This difference of viewpoint between them is discussed under 44.5.

quod modo: a limiting relative clause where *quod modo* is equivalent to *dummodo*, hence the subjunctive *foret*. Cf. *BJ* 64.5; Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.16.

40.1. **igitur P. Umbreno . . . adduci posset:** the smooth structure of the period is avoided by the juxtaposition of a substantival object (*aere alieno oppressos*) and a whole clause (*praeterea*

quod . . . bellicosa esset) and he has therefore to repeat the object (*eos*). See Introd. p. 14 and 16.4 n. *confisus . . . simul quod.*

P. Umbreno: Umbrenus is not mentioned among the conspirators in 17.3. As with Flaminius in 36.1, S. mentions detail for its significance rather than for fulness of treatment. Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.14) associates Umbrenus, P. Furius and Q. Annius in the tampering with the Allobroges.

Allobrogum: a Gallic people whose country lay between the Isara and the Rhone. They had resisted Roman attempts at subjugation for a long time and were at least reduced by Q. Fabius Maximus, who hence obtained the cognomen *Allobrogicus.* Cf. Juvenal, 8.13.

publice privatimque aere alieno oppressos: presumably Catiline's slogan *tabulae novae* would appeal to them, cf. 16.4. Debt was a condition common to Roman provinces, cf. Cicero, *Pro Font.* 11. In spite of their assistance in the conspiracy the Allobroges were justified in their opinion that in the Senate *nihil auxili esset*, and received no real relief from their burdens. They subsequently revolted and had to be reduced by Pomptinus. See on 45.1.

gens Gallica bellicosa: cf. 52.24, 53.4; Cato, 9.12J (*pleraque Gallia duas res industriosissime persequitur rem militarem et argute loqui*); Cicero, *In Cat.* 3.22; Caesar, *BG* 3.19.6, 6.24; Livy, 21.31.5.

40.2. **negotiatus erat:** on annexation, a Roman province was systematically milked of its assets by the imposition of war indemnities and tithes and taxes. To provide the necessary funds provincials had recourse to Roman capitalists who lent money on usurious terms, indulged in extortionate practices and enforced payment through the sale of mortgaged lands. A swarm of *negotiatores* settled on a province to lease the taxes, farm the state lands, contract for roads and utilities, buy up lands that came on the market, and generally thrive on the misery of the provincials. Cicero's speech *pro Fonteio* illustrates this feature of Roman rule in some detail.

civitatium: of feminine nouns in *-tas* which are occasionally found with genitive plural in *-ium*, *civitas* is the commonest; cf. Neue-Wagener, 1.408; *Thes. LL.* 3.1229.51ff.

percontatus: *percontari* suggests not a single question but a fairly detailed inquiry which in turn demands a detailed reply. Its use with *pauca* here might imply that Umbrenus' inside knowledge enabled him to ask questions and interpret answers

more expertly than any other of the conspirators and hence his selection for the task. A simpler explanation, however, might be that the participle was chosen for easy subordination.

quem exitum tantis malis: some take *tantis malis* as ablative absolute. It should be taken as dative governed by *exitum* <*fore*> *sperarent* on the analogy of the verbal phrase *exitum huic rei est.* Cf. *BJ* 14.24.

40.3. **videt:** instead of *audit*; cf. Cicero, *pro Arch.* 18; Livy, 34.31.13. *nunc tyrannum vocari video.*

de avaritia magistratuum: an example is that of C. Calpurnius Piso (49.2), who was prosecuted by Caesar for extortion and the execution of a Transpadane. Cf. Livy, 43.2.1f., and for the specific case of the Allobroges, Cicero, *pro Fonteio.*

miseriis suis: dative depending on *remedium* and could reflect either an old verbal phrase, e.g. Terence, *Andr.* 468: *quod remedium huic malo inveniam,* or the dative construction of the originating verbal notion *mederi.* Cf. 32.1 and 2 *insidias consuli*; Livy, 3.3.5 *id remedium timori fuit.*

40.5. **aliena consili:** genitive instead of ablative; an imitation of a Greek usage not uncommon in Horace (e.g. *patriae exsul*) and, as is the case with many Grecisms, not unaided by Latin analogies such as *expers* (cf. 33.1), *amicus* with gen. and dat., etc. The construction is found only here in S.; elsewhere he uses *a* with the ablative (51.17) and ablative alone (56.5).

ab Roma: S. uses the preposition in this way at *BJ* 104.1. The classical usage is to put the preposition only when the name really stands for the surrounding district or when troops are spoken of as withdrawing from a town (as in *BJ* 61.1.) S. is followed in his usage by Livy, e.g. 42.18.5; cf. Caesar, *BC* 1.11.4; L-H-S, 102. It is a practice common in early Latin: see Bennett, 2.289 for examples. It should be noted that *ab* is preserved mainly by the grammarians, not by the direct tradition. This is a good example of the disappearance of an abnormality from S.'s text.

40.6. **Gabinium . . . quo maior . . . inesset:** Umbrenus, a freedman (Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.14) had not sufficient authority to impress the Allobroges. Gabinius (cf. 17.4) was an *eques* and in the inner circle of the conspiracy. On the tense of *inesset* dependent on the historic present *arcessit* cf. 36.3, 48.5, 50.3 where the present subjunctive is used. The imperfect also occurs in 44.3. See on variation of tenses in 32.2.

multos quoiusque generis: cf. 24.3.

innoxios: see on 39.2.

animus amplior: for this alliteration cf. 59.1; Cato, 42.9J.

operam suam: the nature of their promises is indicated by Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.4 and 9) viz. to start an insurrection in Gaul and to supply Catiline with cavalry for the war in Italy.

41.1 **in incerto habuere:** for the use of *in* with a neuter adjective in lieu of a simple adjective or adverb see 13.3 n. *in propatulo habere.* S. also uses *in incerto habere* in *BJ* 46.8 but varies it to *incertum habere* in *BJ* 95.4 and to *in incerto esse* in *BJ* 38.5, 51.2. The phrase with *habere* may have been modelled on the Greek ἐν ἀπόρῳ εἴχοντο, Thucydides, 1.25.1.

41.2. **tuta consilia:** a fair comment, by contrast, on the nature of the planning which characterised the leadership of the conspiracy. See on 24.1.

pro incerta spe certa praemia: see on 20.2. *Certa praemia* may refer to the promised rewards of 30.6; however in 50.1 we learn that special rewards were voted. The Allobroges may also have felt that the objects of their current mission to Rome would meet with success.

41.3. **fortuna rei publicae:** *Fortuna* was worshipped on the Capitoline and on the Quirinal; see Platner-Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Early Rome*, Oxford, 1929, 212ff.; K. Latte, *Röm. Religionsgeschichte*, 176ff. Here, however, *fortuna* simply means luck; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.22; Livy, 6.30.6. Cf. Ogilvie's note on Livy, 5.34.1. See also on *fortuna* in 10.1.

41.4. **Q. Fabio Sangae:** a contribution by S. to the factual record; there is no mention in Cicero (*in Cat.* 3) of this man.

patrocinio: individual nobles or families of illustrious rank were sometimes patrons of whole states. Such *patroni* were generally those who had reduced them in war or who had been appointed governors over them; cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.35. Rights of patronage were often transmitted to descendants, e.g. the Claudii Marcelli and Sicily. Because of this relationship some scholars assume that Sanga was a descendant of Q. Fabius Maximus (see note on *Allobrogum*, 40.1). It was Fabius Sanga who accused Fonteius on behalf of the Gauls (Cicero, *pro Font.* 26). See *RE* VI.1867(143).

41.5. **consilio cognito:** i.e. the plan of the conspirators to embroil the Allobroges.

praecipit ut . . . simulent etc.: *praecepit* is the reading of all

MSS. After the preceding *aperiunt* a change to the perfect would be exceedingly harsh. But see on 34.1.

bene polliceantur: for a similar use of a verb with an adverb used predicatively where one would expect an object, cf. *BJ* 85.27; Caesar, *BG* 4.21.6; Cicero, *Div.* 2.38.

quam maxume manufestos habeant: on *quam maxume* see on 1.4; *manufestos,* "caught in the act". S., composing *ex eventu,* may be ascribing to a design of Cicero what just happened to occur. See also on 52.36.

42.1. **in Gallia citeriore atque ulteriore:** *Gallia citerior,* south of the Alps, bounded by the rivers Rubicon and Isara; *Gallia ulterior,* north of the Alps, extending to the Rhone and the Cevennes. The hither province was divided into Cispadane and Transpadane with reference to the river Po (*Padus*) which intersected it.

in agro Piceno Bruttio Apulia: note the asyndeton. *Bruttio* is an adjective to *agro.* One might expect the preposition *in* before Apulia, but the asyndeton makes this impossible; *Apulia* must be the third part of the tricolon and the preposition would break this up.

42.2. **ante:** for the facts cf. 27.1, 27.4.

inconsulte ac veluti per dementiam: for such alternation of adverb and noun cf. 51.4, *BJ* 4.7, 88.2. On the aspect of madness in the conspiracy see on 5.8, 15.3-5, and 41.2 *tuta consilia.*

armorum atque telorum: a phrase covering the complete range of weapons, defensive and offensive. Cf. 51.38, *BJ* 105.4.

portationibus: cf. 30.2. *portatio* seems to occur elsewhere only in Vitruvius, 10.1.5, who also twice uses *comportatio,* a word not found elsewhere.

festinando agitando: synonym doublet (Introd. p. 18). On *festinando* see 27.2.

42.3. **ex senatus consulto:** see on 30.6, 36.2. The period of amnesty had presumably expired. On the use of *ex* cf. 12.2: *ex divitiis.*

causa cognita: a juristic formula; cf. *Verr.* 1.15, 2*Verr.* 1.25, *Har. Resp.* 12; Livy, 2.41.10.

in citeriore Gallia C. Murena: C. Licinius Murena was brother and *legatus* of L. Licinius Murena, who had been governor in Gaul in 64/63 B.C. and who left his brother in charge when he went to Rome to stand in the elections in 63 for the consulship

of 62. Cicero (*pro Mur.* 89) speaks of Gallia Transalpina as the province governed by L. Murena and the province in which C. Murena was to be found in 63. Other references are too vague to shed any light on this question (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.5, *pro Mur.* 42, 53, *Har. Resp.* 42). Scholars in general have assumed that S. made an error; thus Cortius chose *in citeriore Gallia* in preference to *in ulteriore Gallia*, a reading adopted by many editors, e.g. Kritz, Dietsch, Ernout and supported by only one MS. The conjecture by M. Cary, *CAH* IX.499, n. 2 that C. Murena was probably temporary governor of both Gauls would, if correct, solve the difficulty. On this possibility see further W. Allen Jr., *CPh.* 48 (1953) 176f.

43.1. **constituerant:** *Lentulus cum ceteris* forms a plural nominative by synesis.

Aefulanum: all codices agree in reading *Faesulanum* here. One gathers from 32.2, 43.2, 44.6 that the plans for arson and massacre were not to be put into execution till Catiline, coming from Faesulae, had got close enough to Rome to take advantage of the ensuing chaos (Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.8). Moreover Bestia would not be tribune until December 10 and we are led to believe from 36.1-3 that Catiline had reached Faesulae long before that date. This obvious contradiction has led to a general rejection of the reading *Faesulanum*. The conjecture of A. Kunze (*Phil. Woch.* 32 (1912), 670ff.) that S. wrote *Aefulanum* which was progressively corrupted to *Aesculanum* and then to *Faesulanum* seems the most satisfactory; cf. J. A. Schmalz, *Phil. Woch.* 36 (1916), 510f. The *ager Aefulanus* is in Latium, north of Praeneste. The fact that Appian, *BC* 2.3 also wrote *Faesulanum* raises the question as to whether the original error was made by S. and not by a scribe. It seems more probable, however, that Appian, who is paraphrasing and summarising, copied S. incorrectly, or that the error had already found its way into the text in the second century.

L. Bestia: see on 17.3.

contione habita: *contio* is the technical term for a public meeting called by a magistrate or general, or for the speech delivered at such a meeting, or possibly even for the area in which such meetings were held. Cf. Gellius, 18.7.6-9.

de actionibus Ciceronis: *actio* is a technical term for official dealings with public assembly or Senate. Its plural, *actiones*, is rarely used of "actions" or "conduct" in a general sense. It was

the policy of the conspirators (Appian, *BC* 2.3; Plutarch, *Cic.* 23) to pretend that Cicero had set in train false rumours of a plot in order to drive innocent men away from the city; that they were honest citizens seeking redress for their wrongs but were manoeuvred by Cicero's manipulations of the Senate (*actionibus*) into a position where they could be dealt with as traitors. The same tone is evident in the letter of Manlius (ch. 33).

optumo consuli: Cicero, *Att.* 12.21.1 complains of Brutus' account of these transactions as calculated to exalt Cato's contribution in comparison with Cicero's. He refers to Brutus' use of the phrase *optimus consul* as disparaging: *quis enim ieiunius dixit inimicus?* The supporters of Schwartz's thesis that S. systematically ridiculed Cicero seize on the use of this phrase by S. as further support for their view. S. could indeed have just used *consuli*, but his phrase *optumo consuli* need occasion no surprise; he has reported in 27.4 that Catiline's own view was that Cicero's vigilance was the greatest obstacle to the execution of his plans; in 48.1 he reports the enthusiastic reception by the plebs of the fruits of Cicero's vigilance; in 51.35f. he reports Caesar's acknowledgement of Cicero's contribution.

proxuma nocte: Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.10, cf. Plutarch, *Cic.* 18.2, states that one of the nights of the *Saturnalia* was appointed for these deeds. The *Saturnalia* began on Dec. 17 and lasted several days. S. gives no date for Bestia's *contio*, but since a *contio* could not be held on a day of the *Saturnalia* it may be that the original plan was fixed for Dec. 10, the day of Bestia's entry upon his tribunate. When no news came of Catiline's approach, the plan, despite the protests of Cethegus (see 43.3,) was postponed to about Dec. 19. Cicero's vigilance anticipated this scheme and the conspirators were executed on Dec. 5.

multitudo coniurationis: i.e. *coniuratorum*.

suum quodque negotium: the MSS show *quoque, que///que, quaeque*. The vulgate *quisque*, which gives complete sense, is a correction which cannot be justified palaeographically. Ernout (*RPh*, 1927, 253) sees the process of corruption as *quoque* (A)—*queque* (N) (*e* for *o* frequently confused in minuscule)—*quaeque* (*rell.*) to agree with *multitudo*. He conjectures that *quoique* is the word from which *quoque* survived in A. He rejects the conjecture *quodque* of B. Ryba (*Phil. Woch.* 46 (1927) 927). On grounds of Latin usage I prefer *quodque*; *quisque* is often attracted into the

case and gender of its accompanying *suus*. Wackernagel, 1.54 cites Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.28: *suum quodque genus vitii.*

43.2. **sed ea divisa ... ad Catilinam erumperent:** according to Cicero these arrangements were made at the meeting at the house of Laeca (cf. 27.4); the details vary according to Cicero's immediate objective. Thus at *in Cat.* 1.9, 2.6, *pro Sulla* 52-3 it is stated that Catiline made the allocation of duties. Lentulus is made responsible for the allocation in *in Cat.* 4.13. Cicero also states that L. Cassius was in charge of the arson squads (*in Cat.* 3.14, 4.13, *pro Sulla* 53). See R. Seager, *Historia* 22 (1973) 241ff.

duodecim simul opportuna loca: Plutarch, *Cic.* 18.2 makes it one hundred.

quo tumultu: *tumultu ex eis rebus orto* (Wirz). Cf. *BJ* 54.6 *ea formidine*, 114.2 *quo metu.*

alius autem alium: Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.8 talks of *caedem infinitam civium*; Plutarch, *Cic.* 18 says it was decided to kill all the senators and as many citizens as they could. Elements of propaganda and exaggeration are palpable in this story.

filii familiarum: cf. 51.9 *matres familiarum.* Varro, *LL* 8.73 says: *si analogias sequi vellent ... plures patres familias dicere non debuerint sed, ut Sisenna scribit, patres familiarum.* S. imitates Sisenna and Tacitus probably followed S., e.g. *Ann.* 1.26,2, 3.8.1, 11.13.2. All other writers from Terence to Quintilian prefer the other form *patres* (*etc.*) *familias*; cf. Priscian, 2.198.6K. On the relationship between fathers and sons see Vell. Pat. 2.67.2; a son's lack of power and independence would explain the eagerness of some *filii familiarum* to kill their fathers. On *patria potestas* in general see O. Karlowa, *Röm. Rechtsgeschichte* II (1892) 79ff., and cf. J. A. Crook, *CQ* ns 17 (1967) 113ff.

43.3. **inter haec parata ... in curiam facturum:** the element of doubt, hesitation and recrimination (cf. 58.4) which beset the conspiracy inside Rome was undoubtedly one of the factors which led to its failure.

parata: Plutarch, *Cic.* 19.2, reports that Caius Sulpicius found a huge store of arms and materials for arson in Cethegus' house. Cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.8.

dies prolatando: the only place where S. uses *prolatare* with an object expressing time. In *Hist.* 4.69.12M he has *pretio in dies bellum prolatans.* Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.42.4.

facto non consulto ... opus esse: see on 1.6 *consulto ... facto.*

Imitated by Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.62.1. *consultando* of several MSS, including P, is a trivialisation, probably caused by the preceding gerundives.

aliis: could stand for *ceteris*, cf. 27.2. It might also be taken as a typically abusive use of *alii*, equivalent to *quidam* in a derogatory sense—"while others sleep".

in curiam: i.e. *in senatum.*

44.1. **item Cassio:** on several occasions, e.g. 54.1, *BJ* 17.2, 40.1, 46.7, S. appears to use *item* in a list to add a detail almost as an afterthought. But *item* is used here, and in 46.3, to add a final name to an asyndetic list; on both occasions something else is reported which differentiates the fate of the last named from that of the rest. In both cases the narrative proceeds with *ceteri* followed by an exception.

iusiurandum . . . signatum: a signed and sealed guarantee, ostensibly to convince their fellow tribesmen in Gaul. In the event this document turned out to be decisive as proof of the complicity of the arrested conspirators (cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.10) and represents the result of the scheme probably hatched by Cicero through Sanga with the Allobroges *uti eos quam maxume manufestos habeant* (41.5).

aliter haud . . . posse: dependent on the saying verb to be supplied from *postulant*; cf. 21.3, 31.7. *Aliter*, as in 29.3 = *alioquin.* Cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.139.

44.2. **eo:** i.e. to Gaul.

44.3. **T. Volturcium quendam Crotoniensem:** a native of Croton on the coast of Bruttium; see on *domi nobiles*, 17.4. Volturcius' attitude at the bridge and at the subsequent hearing gives the impression that he was an innocent dupe throughout; it may be that he formed part of a skilful counterplot by Cicero (Syme, 82 n. 89). The effect of the discovery of the secret message to Catiline represents a triumph of counter-propaganda; to rumours of arson were added alleged plans for setting fire to the city (43.2), incontestable proof of treasonable dealings with a Gallic tribe and the odium of *bellum servile.* It served to arouse the propertied classes and to alienate the urban plebs.

44.4. **quarum exemplum:** see on *earum exemplum*, 34.3.

44.5. **Qui sim . . . etiam ab infumis:** this document is quoted by Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.12); the content is identical, the wording different. Cicero's text is considered to be verbally genuine. S.

has stylistically altered the original by modifying two colloquial phrases and by giving a more normal periodic structure to the sentences. On this letter see further H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Über die Reden und Briefe bei Sallust,* Leipzig, 1888, 25ff.; H. Peter, *Der Brief in der röm. Literatur,* Leipzig, 1901, 170; G. Boissier, *La conjuration de Catilina,* Paris, 1905, 201; K. Latte, *NWzA,* 2R.H4, 1935, 19f.; Earl, 94; Syme, 72.

qui sim ex eo quem ad te misi cognosces: Cicero's version: *quis sim scies ex eo quem ad te misi,* has been altered by changing the colloquial expression *scies ex* (cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 9.17.1; Marx on Lucilius, 757; Plautus, *Capt.* 297, *Curc.* 257), and by the different position given to S.'s verb *cognosces.* Some Sallustian MSS have *quis* here. The formal distinction that *quis* refers to the name and identification only, *qui* to the character of the writer (cf. Livy, 1.41.3) would probably be ignored by Lentulus, writing in haste. The MSS tradition of the Ciceronian version is strongly in favour of *qui.* Löfstedt, *Syntactica,* 2 (1933) 84, notes that before *sim, sis, sit* the *qui* form is the rule to avoid the double *s* (sigmatism).

If Catiline and Lentulus were associates over a period of several months, as S. clearly assumes (cf. 17.3, 32.2, 39.6) this sentence does not make sense. It can only mean that Volturcius would inform Catiline that the letter came from Lentulus. The Latin allows the interpretation that Catiline would recognise Volturcius as a messenger of Lentulus, but this could not be the case since Volturcius joined Lentulus' group (cf. 39.6) only after Catiline had left the city. It does make sense if we suppose that up to this point Catiline and Lentulus had not been confederates. Catiline would need to know the identity of the writer of an anonymous letter despatched under an unfamiliar seal. This and other points discussed below could therefore support the view that Lentulus, like Manlius, was originally the leader of his own dissident movement and later decided to capitalise on the support given to Catiline's confrontation with the authorities. See R. Seager, *Historia* 22 (1973) 241ff.

fac cogites in quanta calamitate sis et memineris te virum esse: S. has altered the Ciceronian version: *cura ut vir sis et cogita quem in locum sis progessus,* by changing the order of commands and using the narrative type *fac cogites* instead of the epistolary *cura ut* (*Thes. LL.* 4.1499.11). He also substitutes for the vague colloquial *quem in locum,* which the reader has to interpret from

his knowledge of the facts (cf. J. B. Hofmann, *Lat. Umgangssprache,* 165ff.) the more concrete *in quanta calamitate.*

quid tuae rationes postulent: perversely, however, this is less concrete than Cicero's *vide ecquid tibi iam sit necesse.*

auxilium petas ab omnibus, etiam ab infumis: the Ciceronian version has the more authentic ring with a passionately repeated *cura ut,* viz. *cura ut omnium tibi auxilium adiungas, etiam infimorum.* S. omits *cura ut* for the sake of brevity and replaces *adiungas* by *petas.* This last change may be because S., who often uses *adiungere* in a similar fashion (e.g. 24.4, *BJ* 10.3, 70.2), wants to preserve the distinction between his own style and that of the letter.

etiam ab infumis: undoubtedly refers to the use of slaves. Lentulus significantly differed from Catiline in his views on this element of support; cf. 44.6, 46.3, 56.5. If Lentulus were the leader of a movement originally separate from that of Catiline, he might well have relied on slaves as an important source of support.

44.6. **mandata verbis:** "verbal instructions"; cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 10.8.5. Cicero's version of these instructions mentions only two recommendations: *ut servorum praesidio uteretur—ut ad urbem quam primum cum exercitu accederet.* (*in Cat.* 3.8).

in urbe parata esse quae iusserit: this, if a reliable statement, would prove a prior connection between the two men. But it is not in Cicero's version and depends on the testimony of Volturcius, who like the Allobroges, was prepared to make any statement that the authorities required (cf. 47.1, 52.36). Nowhere is it stated that Lentulus acknowledged that Volturcius' version was a true account.

45.1. **constituta nocte:** December 3; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.4-6.

L. Valerio Flacco: a descendant of P. Valerius Poplicola, consul with M. Junius Brutus. His father was consul with Marius in 100 B.C. After holding the office of military tribune in Cilicia and of quaestor in Spain, Flaccus attained the praetorship during the consulship of Cicero. On the expiration of his praetorship he went as governor to Asia. On his return he was arraigned for extortion but was acquitted through the exertions of Cicero and Hortensius. In his defence speech Cicero makes much of Flaccus' service to the state in the affair of the Allobroges, *pro Flacc.* 102-3. See *RE* VIIIA. 30(179).

C. Pomptino: the name appears variously in the codices as

Pomptinus, Promptinus, Promptinius. Later as propraetor in Gallia ulterior he besieged and crushed the rebellious Allobroges (Cicero, *Prov. cons.* 32). In 51 B.C. he acted as Cicero's legatus in Cilicia (*Fam.* 3.3.2). See *RE* XXI.2421.

ponte Mulvio: the most northerly bridge over the Tiber, now the Ponte Molle, from which commenced the *via Flaminia*.

Allobrogum comitatus: *comitatus* is plural, equivalent to *omnes qui eos comitabantur*. For the more usual *comitatu* cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.6; Caesar, *BC* 3.96.4.

agant permittit: S. seems to have been the first to omit *ut* after *permittere*. Such an omission becomes common later, especially in Livy. See on *decrevit*, 29.2.

45.2. **homines militares:** causal apposition, cf. Livy 35.26.10. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.5 describes them, for the purposes of his speech, as *fortissimi et amantissimi rei publicae . . . qui omnia de re publica praeclara atque egregia sentirent.* S. is commenting merely on the military efficiency of the operation.

pontem obsidunt: Cicero goes into greater detail in *in Cat.* 3.5.

45.3. **ad id loci:** cf. *BJ* 75.7. The partitive genitive of *locus* in this and similar expressions is colloquial and archaic, cf. Terence, *Phorm.* 979. Compare Plautus' use of *loci, locorum* with adverbs of time and place, e.g. *Capt.* 958, *Merc.* 986, *Rud.* 1161. See L-H-S, 53.

utrimque clamor etc.: a *topos* of a battle description (Fraenkel, *Horace*, 118) used to give vividness to a tense moment; cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 228; Virgil, *Geo.* 4.75-78; Cicero, *Att.* 1.16.1 (see Bailey's note); Livy, 1.48.2 (Ogilvie's note); Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.77-78.

cito cognito consilio: Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.6) expressly states that only the praetors knew of the plan in detail. The Allobroges would, naturally, quickly interpret the situation.

45.4. **vitae diffidens:** a *variatio* on the more usual *salute desperata*. He has already used *de salute* in the preceding sentence.

46.1. **quibus rebus . . . consuli declarantur:** the emphasis conveyed by *propere* (cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.6) and the use of the formal title *consul* govern the content of the following chapters—the mental struggle of Cicero and the haste with which he proceeds to prosecution. As consul he had to think and act quickly in a situation in which decisive action could not be expected from any other quarter. The mental turmoil which expresses itself in hasty action also emerges from Cicero's account in the *Third Catilinarian*.

46.2. **at illum ingens cura atque laetitia simul occupavere:**

the fundamental antithesis of *cura* and *laetitia* is reinforced by the use of *simul* and perhaps of the strong verb *occupavere*.

tantis civibus deprehensis: ablative absolute, giving the circumstance of *dubitans . . . quid facto opus esset*. For Cicero's doubts see Appendix VI.

poenam illorum sibi oneri, impunitatem . . . fore credebat: here the underlying antithesis of the whole chapter receives concrete expression in the contrast emphasised between *poenam* and *impunitatem*.

oneri: undoubtedly refers to the problems facing Cicero at the moment, but it is hardly conceivable that S. did not at the same time have thoughts about the troubles that plagued Cicero down to his exile in 58 B.C.

One of the immediate problems was to decide whether he should refer the matter to the Senate at all. He had been accused of raising false alarms, of exaggerating the danger and of irresponsibly heightening the tension. This feature is crystallised in *in Cat.* 3.7 where Cicero describes his decision not to open the letters captured from the Allobroges, in spite of powerful advice to the contrary: *ne, si nihil esset inventum, temere a me tantus tumultus iniectus civitati videretur.*

perdundae rei publicae: to be taken, like *oneri*, as a predicative dative; see L-H-S, 75 on Plautus, *Rud.* 1374; *ius iurandum rei servandae, non perdendae conditum est*; *ibid.* 98; Bennett, 1.443.

46.3. **igitur confirmato animo:** S. omits to add that Cicero sought advice and was given counsel by his brother and by P. Nigidius Figulus (Plutarch, *Cic.* 20.2).

itemque: the function of *item* mentioned at 44.1 is here absolutely clear.

Caeparium Terracinensem: cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.14. Caeparius, a native of Terracina, a city of the Volsci, is especially associated with the element of slave support. See on 56.5 and cf. 17.4 n. *domi nobiles*.

46.4. **ceteri sine mora:** but cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.6 for Lentulus: *tardissime autem Lentulus venit.*

cognito indicio: having learnt, that is, that information had been given, not what that information was.

46.5. **consul Lentulum . . . perducit, reliquos . . . venire iubet:** the sentence clearly means: "Lentulus he took himself, the others he ordered to the temple; there he assembled the Senate".

The words *in senatum* of the MSS are bracketed or deleted by some editors (e.g. Kritz, Dietsch) as a gloss; they consider them unnecessary because of the following *in aedem Concordiae* which is taken to cover the action of both *perducit* and *venire iubet.* But *in senatum* forms the necessary local complement to *perducit.* It could mean that Lentulus, because of his rank, was led by Cicero directly into the Assembly room while the others awaited their turn for interrogation in a room adjoining the temple.

cum custodibus: very probably the detachment that had been used at the bridge.

in aedem Concordiae: a temple on the Capitoline, facing the Forum. Erected by Camillus (Plutarch, *Cam.* 42), it was embellished by L. Opimius after the death of C. Gracchus (Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 17.6) and meetings of the Senate were frequently held within its walls.

46.6. **eo senatum advocat:** we learn from *pro Sulla* 41 that Cicero commissioned four Senators of repute to take a verbatim report of the evidence; this would be entered in the public records and subsequently published.

magnaque frequentia: "at a full meeting". The Senate nominally amounted to 600 members, but vacancies by death and by absence on provincial duties must be taken into account. From Cicero (*Att.* 1.14.5, cf. *post red. Sen.* 26) we learn that 415 Senators voted at a full meeting on one occasion.

Volturcius cum legatis: if by this S. means that both Volturcius and the Gauls were introduced at the same time, he is contradicted by Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.8: *introduxi Volturcium sine Gallis.*

47.1. **Volturcius interrogatus . . . habuisset:** a typically Sallustian tripartite sentence in which the last part is introduced by *postremo* simply to separate it from the two shorter parts which are related to each other by asyndeton. This use of *postremo* without any temporal element involved (see on 14.6) and used as the close of an enumeration is a feature of early Latin; cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 613, 662; Caecilius, 204R.

quid aut qua de causa consili: i.e. *quid consili aut qua de causa id habuisset* (Kritz).

dissimulare de coniuratione: *de coniuratione* instead of the normal accusative because the object is not really *coniuratio* but rather a knowledge of the conspiracy, *coniurationis conscientiam.*

fide publica: a modal ablative; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.8. On *fides publica* see Val. Max. 6.6; *Thes. LL.* 6.669.50ff.

omnia uti gesta . . . aperit: the details, as S. accepted them, are enumerated in 48.4.

docetque: refers to the second part of the question, i.e. *qua de causa id consilium habuisset.*

nihil amplius scire quam legatos: his general statement at this stage is of the same content as the opening statement of the Gauls: *eadem Galli fatentur.* Thus from *pro Sulla* 36 we learn that the Allobroges also gave the names of the chief conspirators.

47.2. **ex libris Sibyllinis:** cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.9. The Sibylline books consisted of oracles brought, according to legend, from Gergis in the Troad and from Erythrae to Campania and from there to Rome in the period of Tarquinius Superbus. Cf. Dion. Hal. 4.62; Pliny, *NH* 13.88; Lactantius, 1.6.10-11; Servius, *Aen.* 6.72. They were accompanied by a wave of Hellenic influence which led to the worship of Apollo and other Greek gods.

When the originals were destroyed in the burning of the Capitol in 83 B.C. new books were compiled. The content of the books was regarded as a state secret and a special board (originally *duoviri sacris faciundis*, expanded in 367 into *decemviri* and in 82 or 81 into *quindecimviri*) consulted them only at times of great crisis. Unauthorised prophecies leaked out at times to be freely interpreted by the fancy of the people and often used, as here, for political ends. Cicero, *Div.* 2.110 reports on the circulation of a prophecy used to support the claim of a kingly name for Caesar. Livy, 3.10.7, 38.45.3 gives examples of similar cases in earlier times.

For detail concerning *libri Sibyllini* see H. Diels, *Sibyllinische Blätter*, 1890, 6-20; W. Hoffmann, *Wandel u. Herkunft d. sib. Bücher in Rom*, 1933; F. Altheim, *History of Roman Religion*, 240-2; R. Bloch, *Mélanges Ernout*, 21ff.; K. Latte, *Religionsgeschichte*, 160-1. For the historicity of the tradition see especially Ogilvie on Livy, 5.13.5.

Cinnam: L. Cornelius Cinna, consul for the years 87-84 B.C. Headed a popular reaction against the oligarchy during Sulla's absence in the East. Driven out and unconstitutionally deposed by the Senate, he returned triumphantly with Marius. In spite of his long tenure of office he gave no signs of any desire to reform the state; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.24.5: *in consultando temerarium, in exequendo virum*; Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.19M; *RE* IV.1282(106).

urbis potiri: *potiri* is occasionally used with the genitive, particularly with the standard phrase *rerum potiri* (L-H-S, 83; Wackernagel, 1.69). S., e.g. *BJ* 25.10, 75.2, 76.5, 92.4, uses both ablative and genitive indifferently and once, *BJ* 74.3, uses both cases in the same sentence.

ab incenso Capitolio: Lactantius, 3.17.12 indicates that the Capitol was three times destroyed by fire. Appian, *BC* 1.83, Plutarch, *Sulla* 27.6 (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.72) report its destruction in 83 B.C. during the troubles occasioned by the struggle between Marius and Sulla. This is the burning to which the present passage refers. The Capitol was later rebuilt by Sulla and dedicated by Catulus. In A.D. 70 it was burnt by the soldiers of Vitellius (Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.72, 4.54.2). The emperor Vespasian rebuilt it and at his death it was burned a third time. Domitian restored it with greater magnificence than ever.

haruspices: who derived omens from an inspection of the entrails of victims. This was an Etruscan system of divination, added to the older Roman practice of augury from the flight of birds.

respondissent: *respondere* is the appropriate technical term for *haruspices*. Cf. Cicero, *Har. Resp.*

47.3. **perlectis litteris:** cf. 44.1. The content as reported by Cicero was: *sese quae eorum legatis confirmasset facturum esse; orare ut item illi facerent quae sibi eorum legati recepissent.* (*in Cat.* 3.10).

quom prius ... signa ... cognovissent: technical terminology; cf. Plautus, *Bacch.* 789: *nosce signum. Novi.*, *ibid.* 986, *Curc.* 423, 550, *Pseud.* 988.

senatus decernit: Cicero records, from memory, what the Senate voted on this occasion; in addition to the decree *in liberis custodiis habeantur*, it moved a vote of thanks to the consul and voted a *supplicatio* in Cicero's honour (*in Cat.* 3.14-15).

abdicato magistratu: the usual phrase is *abdicare se magistratu*, as in Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.15. S.'s construction with a direct accusative is used also by Livy, e.g. 2.28.9 (Ogilvie *ad loc.*) 5.49.9, 6.18.4. A Roman magistrate could not be deposed, but pressure was often brought to bear on an official to resign, since a magistrate was immune from punishment. See E. J. Weinrib, *Phoenix* 22 (1968) 32ff.

in liberis custodiis: it was Roman practice to keep criminals under arrest in their own houses (Cicero, *2 Verr.* 5.73) or to discharge

them on bail (*vades*) till the trial, or, especially in the case of officials and nobles, to consign them to the custody of people held responsible for their safe keeping (*libera custodia*). Cf. Cassius Dio, 58.3; Plutarch, *Cic.* 19; Cicero, *Brut.* 330; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.3.3; Vell. Pat. 1.11.1. On the plural *liberis custodiis* cf. 14.5 *familiaritates*, 15.4 *quietibus*, 50.3 and 4 *custodiam . . . custodiis*. The emphasis here is on individual conspirators and their respective custodians.

47.4. **P. Lentulo Spintheri:** possibly of the house of the Cornelii, but his family relationships are difficult to establish. Consul in 57 with Q. Metellus Nepos, he was mainly responsible for the recall of Cicero from exile. An ardent Republican, he followed Brutus and Cassius after the death of Caesar. See *RE* IV.1392(238).

Q. Cornificio: one of the seven candidates for the consulship of 63. Some scholars make him identical with the Q. Cornificius who was governor of Africa in 44. Others maintain, on the basis of Cicero, *Fam.* 12.17 and 23, that the latter was a younger man, probably the son of this Cornificius. See *RE* IV, 1624(7).

C. Caesari . . . M. Crasso: on the significance of this for the alleged implication of these men in the conspiracy, see on 48.5.

paulo ante: just prior to the consignment to house arrest. He was not present at the interrogation; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.10ff.

Cn. Terentio: praetor in the following year. See *RE* VA.596(21).

Chs. 48-55: *The Suppression of the Conspiracy in Rome*

The section 48.3-49.4 which contains accusations of implication in the conspiracy against Crassus and Caesar, is considered a digression by Bauhofer, *Die Komposition der Historien Sallusts*, Diss. München, 1935. Vretska, however, (*Hermes*, 72 (1937) 202ff.) rightly considers it to be a preparation for the chief event of this part of the work, the Senate debate on the conspirators. This latter leads on to what is truly a digression, the comparison between Caesar and Cato.

48.1-2. **interea plebs . . . cultu corporis erant:** this decisive change of mind on the part of the urban plebs is largely the fruit of the emphatic counter-propaganda of Cicero's *Third Catilinarian*, delivered immediately after the meeting of the Senate described in ch. 47.

Catiline's alleged plans for arson (cf. 43.2) form the keynote of Cicero's attempt to wrest from him the support of the populace;

cf. *in Cat.* 3.1 and 2. The threat of fire is throughout the major point of this speech; cf. *ibid.* 8, 9, 15. Cicero may have exaggerated (but cf. Cassius Dio, 37.34; Plutarch, *Cic.* 18, *Cato Min.* 22; Appian, *BC* 2.3), yet he skilfully makes his point by recalling to the memories of his listeners the carnage associated with Marius, Sulpicius Rufus and Cinna, and by drawing a distinction between Catiline and his predecessors in violence.

48.1. **cupida rerum novarum:** see on 28.4.

ex servitute erepta: note the variation of construction from *periculis ereptam* in 46.2.

gaudium atque laetitiam agitabant: synonym doublet (Introd. p. 18). For the use of *agitare* with nouns of emotion see also 61.9. On the coupling of finite verbs with historic infinitives see Introd. p. 20.

48.2. **incendium vero crudele:** a decisive factor in their change of mind; for the living conditions of the urban plebs which form the background to this remark see Z. Yavetz, *Latomus* 17 (1958) 500ff., esp. 516.

quippe quoi . . . erant: S. invariably uses the indicative after *quippe qui* which occurs only here in *Bell. Cat.*; cf. *BJ* 7.6, 14.10, 20.6, 28.1 *et al.* Dräger, *Hist. Syntax*, 2.173 views this as an archaism. *Utpote qui*, in the only place it occurs, viz. 57.4, is followed by subjunctive, and the same applies to causal *qui*, cf. 52.8. On *quippe* used alone see on 11.8.

in usu cottidiano et cultu corporis: used in a concrete sense. *In usu* = *quae usui erant*, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.30.1: *vitae usus*; *BJ* 84.3. *Cultu* = clothing etc.

48.3. **Post eum diem:** equivalent to *postridie* which is never used by S.

quidam L. Tarquinius: for the unusual position of *quidam* cf. *BJ* 93.2; for the normal position, *BC* 24.2 *Manlium quendam.* Nothing else is known about Tarquinius—*RE* IVA.2390(10).

48.4. **de paratis incendiis** etc.: anaphora of the preposition *de* underlines the important elements of the information given. The details concerning arson and massacre are the same as those Cicero had learned weeks before through Fulvia (*in Cat.* 1.8); he also implies that the Allobroges supplied the same information (*in Cat.* 3.10). It is possible that the conspirators in the city might have expressed such intentions in order to convince the envoys of their determination to revolt; it is also possible that the envoys,

and even probable that Volturcius and Tarquinius were acting under instructions from the consul.

praeterea se missum ... e periculo eriperentur: the explicit nature of these charges and the reaction to them reported by the historian are in marked contrast to the vague and neutral charges levelled at Caesar in 49.1ff. Such an attitude to Caesar has been interpreted as proof of S.'s partisan aims in this monograph. Cf. 22.3 n. *Ciceronis invidiam.*

Allegations against Caesar are specifically labelled false (49.1, 4). S. has reported in 47.4 that two of the conspirators were placed in the custody of Crassus and Caesar, but this has, inevitably, been interpreted as a subtle move on the part of the Senate either to tie the hands of men suspected of being implicated or to cause them to be alienated from their presumed associates. Evidence against Caesar is so slight that it is generally supported by that against Crassus, on the assumption that both act in concert throughout these years, as, e.g. in the plans to annex Egypt, their support of Catiline's candidature for the consulship of 63. Cf., e.g. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context, passim.*

S.'s readiness to report current rumours against Crassus (17.7, 19.1f) who must have used a variety of schemes to further his own designs, without necessarily acting in concert with Caesar, and his method of dealing with the accusations against Caesar should be taken at their face value. Any attempt to read between the lines leads almost inevitably to fanciful hypotheses without sure foundation in fact, e.g. E. T. Salmon, *AJPh.* 56 (1935) 302ff.

deprehensi terrerent: passive participle used for verbal noun, cf. 1.6.

48.5. **hominem nobilem:** S. uses *vir* in apposition when he means to praise, not when he is mentioning external characteristics which do not determine a man's worth (Fabri). Compare *BJ* 70.2, 77.1 with *BC* 51.16, 53.6, *BJ* 22.2, 27.2, 43.1. On *nobilem* see 20.7 n. *nobiles.*

alii ... pars ... plerique: breaks up the general subject of *conclamant* into its various parts.

tametsi verum existumabant: cf. the statement in 17.7.

in tali tempore: equivalent to *in tali rerum condicione*; cf. *BJ* 66.3; Cicero, *Fam.* 9.16.1; Livy, 22.35.7, 24.28.1 *et al.*

tanta vis hominis: see on *scriptorum magna ingenia*, 8.3.

ex negotiis privatis obnoxii: the numerous loans or bribes

which Crassus' enormous wealth enabled him to make gave him a private influence unequalled by any individual of his time.

ut referatur: i.e. *ad senatum a consule*. A *relatio* always implied a subsequent consultation; cf. 50.3 *quid de iis fieri placeat*. The topic in this instance was so explosive that no individual was prepared to commit himself without the opportunity to explore general opinion.

48.6. **videri:** reflects the content of the Senate's decision and does not denote any uncertainty. Cf. Cicero, *Acad.* 2.146 (*maiores voluerunt*) *qui testimonium diceret, ut arbitrari se diceret etiam quod ipse vidisset; quaeque iurati iudices cognovissent, ea non ut esse facta sed ut videri pronuntiarentur*. See Ogilvie on Livy, 2.54.10; D. Daube, *Forms of Roman Legislation*, 73-77.

potestatem: i.e. *indicandi*.

tantam rem esset mentitus: the subjunctive conveys the Senate's judgement concerning the falsity of Tarquinius' statement, not that of the historian. *Mentior* is normally used with *in* or *de aliqua re*. Its use with the accusative is poetical, and is imitated by Livy, e.g. 10.40.4.

48.7-9. **erant eo tempore ... sibi ab Cicerone impositam:** this matter is just the sort of thing which Cicero is likely to have touched upon in his *de Consiliis Suis* (Introd. p. 7) and if S. knew that work this is a place where one could have expected him clearly to show his knowledge of it. However, one can only speculate about the *de Consiliis Suis*.

48.7. **machinatum:** a deponent used in a passive sense; cf. *Hist.* 2.70.3, 4.8M. This appears to be the first time *machinor* has been used in this way, cf. *Thes. LL.* 8.17.66. See also 7.3 n. *adepta libertate*.

appellato Crasso ... illius potentia: the name is divorced from the sentence by the ablative absolute and is thus given extra emphasis, an emphasis which is strengthened by the use of *appellare*, a technical term for "appeal"; cf. Livy, 8.33.7 *tribunos plebis apello et provoco*; *Thes. LL.* 2.273.62ff.

48.8. **inmissum:** "instigated, suborned", a word used of informers, false witnesses, hired assassins; cf. Cicero, *pro Sest.* 78; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.19.1; Pliny, *Ep.* 6.31.3; Justin, 9.7.1, 32.2.9.

more suo: from its manner of expression (cf. 17.7, 19.1) this seems to be S.'s own judgement, but Cicero, *Off.* 1.25.109 testifies to Crassus' practice in this regard, cf. *Parad.* 45.

patrocinio: Plutarch, *Crass.* 3.2 speaks of the readiness with which Crassus gave his help to defendants in law cases and of the influence he gained thereby.

48.9. **ipsum Crassum . . . praedicantem:** this could possibly refer to a well-known altercation in the Senate in 55 B.C. (Cassius Dio, 39.60.1; cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 1.9.20; Mommsen, *Staatsrecht,* 1.570).

contumeliam sibi ab Cicerone inpositam: while it is possible that in a later stage of estrangement Crassus may have stated that this was the background to the Tarquinius affair, it is unlikely that the consul would have wished to antagonise Crassus at this crucial stage. He acknowledges in his *de Consulatu Suo* the help given him by Crassus in the counter-measures against Catiline (Plutarch, *Crass.* 13.3; cf. *Cic.* 15.1; Cassius Dio, 37.31.1).

49.1. **Q. Catulus:** see on 34.3.

C. Piso: C. Calpurnius Piso, consul in 67. A determined Optimate, he had strongly resisted the conferment of extraordinary powers on Pompeius, had successfully opposed the efforts of the tribune C. Cornelius to check bribery by heavier penalties, introducing instead his own bill on *ambitus,* the *lex Calpurnia.* In the process he also thwarted Cornelius' proposal to make the people the sole source of exemption from the laws (Asconius 58C; Cassius Dio, 36.39.2). Sallust (*Hist.* 4.81M) records that when candidate in 68 he bought off a prosecutor with an enormous bribe. On his return from the governorship of Hither Gaul he was prosecuted by Julius Caesar for extortion and the execution of a Transpadane. He was defended by Cicero (*pro Flacc.* 98). See *MRR* 2.142f; *RE* III.1376(63).

[**neque precibus**] **neque pretio neque gratia:** there is some variation in the MSS. but most read *neque precibus neque gratia neque pretio.* Some editors, on the authority of Priscian (2.539.19K) omit *neque precibus* on the grounds that it is implied in *gratia.* There is no irrefutable reason for rejecting *precibus* nor for altering the order preferred by the MSS. S. may well have intended a climax of persuasion in order to emphasise the absurdity of the accusation—"neither by entreaties nor by the promise of present and future influential support nor even by money offered". On *gratia* see 20.8 n. *gratia.*

falso nominaretur: S.'s own judgement on the matter; see on 48.4. The episode of L. Vettius who in 62 produced revelations about the conspiracy and who in 59 died mysteriously in prison

(Suetonius, *Jul.* 17; *RE* VIIIA.1844(6) may also have been on S.'s mind.

49.2. **inimicitias:** political enmity which had developed into personal hatred.

exercebat: some MSS. have *exercebant* and as such it would be the only instance where S. uses *uterque* with a plural verb, cf. 30.4. The plural might be excused here on the grounds of the following *Piso ... Catulus.*

ex petitione pontificatus: for *ex* see on 12.2 n. *ex divitiis.* When the office of Pontifex Maximus fell vacant on the death of Q. Metellus Pius at the end of 64 or early in 63, Labienus, a tribune of 63, was responsible for the restoration of the *lex Domitia* of 104 which Sulla had repealed .This law gave the election of the Pontifex to the tribes, and Caesar by lavish bribery secured an enormous majority. Plutarch, *Caes.* 7 gives the story; cf. Suetonius, *Jul.* 13: *ita ... superavit ut plura ipse in eorum tribubus suffragia quam uterque in omnibus tulerit.* L. R. Taylor, *CPh* 37 (1942) 421ff., believes that the election on this occasion was probably not affected by the *lex Domitia.*

extrema aetate ... ab adulescentulo: terminology probably used by the aggrieved Catulus and which must be taken in a relative sense. Caesar, born in 100 B.C., or, according to Mommsen, in 102 (but cf. E. Badian, *JRS* 49 (1959) 81-89), was 37 or 39, relatively young for the supreme pontificate. Catulus was about twenty years older, but hardly old enough to merit the description *extrema aetate*; the implication is that, since the pontificate was a life appointment, Catulus had no chance of realising his ambition. On the term *adulescentulus* see on 3.3.

maxumis honoribus usus: Catulus had been consul in 78, censor in 65 and was now *omnium confessione princeps senatus* (Vell. Pat. 2.43.3). See on 34.3.

49.3. **res autem opportuna videbatur:** i.e. their objective of getting Caesar suspected seemed favoured by circumstances. Caesar's connection with Crassus was well-known; moreover the fact of Caesar's known debts would make it feasible that he favoured Catiline's programme of *tabulae novae.*

privatim ... publice ... pecuniam debebat: *privatim* and *publice* go with *liberalitate* and *muneribus* respectively. Plutarch, *Caes.* 5.4 reports that Caesar's debts amounted to 1300 talents before he attained any office. His extravagant shows as curule

aedile increased this indebtedness enormously; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.56; Suetonius, *Jul.* 10ff.; Appian, *BC* 2.8; Cassius Dio, 37.8.2. Before his departure to Spain as propraetor in 61 he had amassed debts amounting to over 20 million sesterces and could only leave Rome when Crassus stood as guarantee (Plutarch, *Caes.* 11.1; Suetonius, *Jul.* 18). For the connection between debt and the pursuit of office in the late Republic see M. Jaczynowska, *Historia* 11 (1962) 486ff.

49.4. **quae se . . . audisse dicerent:** the verb of saying has been attracted into the subjunctive from that verb to which the subjunctive properly belongs. In other words, *quae se . . . audisse dicerent* is equivalent to *quae, ut dicebant, audissent.* For similar instances cf. Cicero, 2*Verr.* 1.98, 5.17; Caesar, *BG* 1.23.3, 1.39.3, 5.6.3. See Mayor on *Phil.* 2.7; Nisbet on *Dom.* 22; Austin on *pro Cael.* 3.

conflaverant: the pluperfect used with reference to the following *usque eo ut* etc. See on 18.6, 24.1.

nonnulli equites Romani: part of the objective of Cicero's propaganda had been to bring about a *concordia ordinum,* based on *consensus omnium bonorum,* i.e. of citizens who had most to lose if Catiline's programme ever got under way. On the attitude of the knights see Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.21, 2.25, 4.22, *post red. Sen.* 12, *in Pis.* 7, *pro Sest.* 28, *pro Flacc.* 96, *Att.* 1.14.4, 2.1.7.

seu . . . magnitudine seu . . . mobilitate: as often, S. gives two possible reasons, one based on the situation, the other on the fact of human nature. Cf. Ogilvie on Livy, 1.4.2.

quo studium . . . clarius esset: there is the possibility that this represents a third reason, *sive* having fallen out of the text.

egredienti ex senatu Caesari: elsewhere, e.g. *BJ* 15.2, 91.3, 4, S. uses *egredior* with ablative alone.

This incident of the Roman knights probably occurred after Caesar's oration in the debate of Dec. 5 and was the result of Cato's appeal to *concordia ordinum* (Plutarch, *Caes.* 8; Suetonius, *Jul.* 14.2). S., through forgetfulness or by design, has shifted the chronology and thus gives the impression that this attack was the result of the activity of Catulus and Piso.

50.1. **Dum haec in senatu aguntur:** refers back to 48.6.

Dum haec . . . et dum . . . decernuntur: a typically Sallustian sentence, showing his liking for parataxis (with double *dum*) and his preference for passive expressions (Introd. p. 19). A normal

narrative style might have been content with *quibus rebus cognitis senatus . . . decernit.*

praemia: Cicero (*in Cat.* 4.5) talks of *praemia amplissima.* What the reward actually was is not known. The arrangements outlined in 30.6 may have been applied to Volturcius.

liberti: *libertus* was used of a freedman when spoken of in relation to his manumitter; *libertinus* was used with regard to his status in society—he was *non ingenuus.* Cf. Gaius, *Inst.* 1.10 and 11; *Dig.* 1.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.57.2.

opifices atque servitia . . . sollicitabant: Cicero (*in Cat.* 4.17) speaks of *opifices* as not interested, being *genus amantissimum oti.* The incitement of slaves in this instance is not to be confused with the more serious purpose of enlisting slaves in the army of the rebels as, e.g. in 30.2.

partim: elsewhere, e.g. *BJ* 13.2, 19.5 *et al.*, S. uses *partim . . . alii* (or equivalent) in the same way as *pars . . . alii* (Introd. p. 15). Where *partim* or *pars* (cf. *BJ* 31.10) is used without a correlative it indicates that while the action of the first part of the sentence applies to all, the action of the second part is restricted to a few. Cf. Cicero, 2*Verr.* 2.158, *Div.* 2.23.

duces multitudinum: clubs and guilds (*collegia, sodalicia*) were manipulated in the last decades of the Republic by political agents for party ends and their leaders very often became inciting agents in a popular disturbance. *Multitudinum,* a fairly rare use of the plural, to indicate different "gangs".

soliti erant: *soliti* used almost as an adjective. For *solitus sum* = *soleo,* apparently an archaism, see Ennius, *Ann.* 221V: *Poeni suos soliti dis sacrificare puellos.*

50.2. **familiam:** from *famulus,* a servant, denotes the slaves of his household.

lectos et exercitatos: participles to be taken as adjectives.

orabat in audaciam: Dietsch, followed by Jordan, Ahlberg, deleted *in audaciam* as a gloss. Kvičala proposed to take *in audaciam* with *grege facto,* "after forming a band to give each other courage". Kritz transposed to *exercitatos in audaciam, orabat,* a very attractive conjecture, recommended by Kunze. If we could assume that S. coined *orare in* on the analogy of *hortari in* (*Thes. LL.* 6.3010.72ff.)—but I can find no closely comparable innovation in S.—the reading as it stands would make sufficient sense, the meaning being expanded by *ut grege facto . . . inrumperent.*

50.3-4. **consul ubi ea parari ... referendum censuerat:** S.'s brevity obscures the chronology. We have here a summary of what took place on two days, Dec. 3 and 4. *In custodiam traditi erant* refers to the events of Dec. 3; cf. Cicero's *nudius tertius*, "the day before yesterday", in *in Cat.* 4.10 and 13. *Tum D. Junius Silanus ... decreverat* is unanimously allocated by the sources to Dec. 5. Between these two sets of facts and dates lies the statement of S., mentioned by no other source, that a full meeting of the Senate had resolved that the actions of the conspirators now in custody were *contra rem publicam*. In his orations of Dec. 3 (*in Cat.* 3) and Dec. 5 (*in Cat.* 4) Cicero makes no mention of such a resolution. It seems feasible to suggest that the order of business on Dec. 4 was (a) the rejection of Tarquinius' testimony (48.3-9); (b) the rewards to Volturcius and the Allobroges (50.1, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.5); (c) the resolution that the arrested conspirators had acted *contra rem publicam* (50.3). The furore over the attempted implication of Crassus and the uncertainty in the Senate about public opinion on the conspiracy would account for the fact that Cicero had on Dec. 4 to be satisfied with an inconclusive vote (*iudicaverat*). See D. H. Garrison, *CJ* 57 (1962) 360ff.

50.3. **consul ... convocato senatu refert:** S.'s treatment of this crucial meeting of Dec. 5 is marked by synthesis and omissions; cf. P. Stein, *Die Senatssitzungen der ciceronischen Zeit*, Diss. Münster, 1930, 15f. Once again place and date are omitted. The meeting was actually held in the temple of Concord on the Capitoline (Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.14, *Att.* 2.1.7; Cassius Dio, 37.35.4).

quid de iis ... traditi erant: if the question was put in this form, Silanus (50.4) seems to be going beyond the terms of reference when he speaks of conspirators not yet arrested. Both Caesar (51.43) and Cato (52.36) confine their resolutions to the conspirators in custody. Cicero's own careful framing of the question put to the Senate leaves this point undecided: *sed ego institui referre ad vos, patres conscripti, tamquam integrum, et de facto quid iudicetis et de poena quid censeatis* (*in Cat.* 4.6).

sed eos ... fecisse: this sentence interrupts the flow of the narrative. *Sed* has been used before to introduce a parenthesis or digression, cf. 8.1, 18.1, 25.1, 43.2, 53.2. *Refert* is taken up by *tum* (50.4).

paulo ante: very probably on Dec. 4.

frequens senatus: see on 48.6.

contra rem publicam fecisse: a form of words used against those who were considered guilty of treasonable or seditious conduct. Cf. Cicero, *Q. Fr.* 2.3.3, *Fam.* 8.8.6, *pro Mil.* 12; A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, London, 1911, 277. It was equivalent to proclaiming the arrested men *hostes*, cf. 36.2. When put in the future tense, as in 51.43, it was intended as a most serious warning. For a discussion of this form of censure see P. Willems, *Le sénat* 2.254ff.; Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 3.1067-9.

50.4. **D. Junius Silanus:** consul for 62 with L. Licinius Murena. Married to Servilia, half-sister of Cato and mother by a former marriage of M. Brutus, the slayer of Caesar. See *RE* X.1090(163).

primus sententiam rogatus: the custom of calling upon the *consules designati* to open a debate, which would naturally apply only in the second half of the year, seems to have been an old one (Cicero, *Phil.* 5.35); the reason for the procedure is given by Appian, *BC* 2.5. In the earlier part of the year it was a general custom to call upon the *princeps senatus* first, followed by the *consulares*, but the presiding magistrate might alter this order at his discretion, cf. Gellius, 14.7.9. Thus Plutarch, *Caes.* 8.1, *Cic.* 21.3 reports that Catulus, *princeps senatus*, spoke after Caesar, praetor-designate. Cicero, *Att.* 1.13.2 remarks in January 61 that the presiding consul gave preference in order of debate to his own brother, C. Calpurnius Piso, at Cicero's expense.

P. Furio: has not been named by S. before this. Cicero (*in Cat.* 3.14) mentions him as *ex iis colonis quos Faesulas L. Sulla deduxit*, and he may well be the *Faesulanus quidam* commanding the left wing of Catiline's army at Pistoria (59.3). See *RE* VII.317 (23).

decreverat: for the tense see on *transtulerant* 18.6.

isque postea permotus . . . censuerat: an extreme example of synthesis on S.'s part, one which causes him to obscure or omit several important details. Thus (a) no mention is made of the fact that all the consulars present, fourteen in number, concurred in Silanus' original motion, *supplicium sumundum*; for a list of these consulars see Cicero, *Att.* 12.21.1—a similar list, in *Phil.* 2.12f., does not mention this debate and among other discrepancies includes Crassus, who was absent (*in Cat.* 4.10); (b) Cassius Dio's statement (37.36.2) that all who spoke between Caesar and Cato supported Caesar—cf. Plutarch, *Caes.* 8.1, *Cato Min.* 22.3, *Cic.* 21.1; Suetonius, *Jul.* 14.2; Appian, *BC* 2.6—contradicts Cicero's

faulty recall of the details in *Att.* 12.21.1 *Catonem primum sententiam putat de animadversione dixisse, quam omnes ante dixerant praeter Caesarem*; (c) it is not made clear that Ti. Nero spoke much later in the debate, after Caesar (cf. *in Cat.* 4.7). Appian, the only other source to mention Ti. Nero, places this amendment before Caesar's speech (*BC* 2.5), probably misled by the extreme brevity of S.'s statement. But the motion as Appian reports it, advising delay until Catiline is defeated and more facts are available, is more satisfying than S.'s brief *de ea re . . . censuerat.* See further on 51.43.

In spite of the ample evidence available it is not easy to sort out the order of the motions and amendments in this debate or to establish the line of thought which prompted them. For a statement of the problem see T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic,* 1.467ff.

pedibus in sententiam Ti. Neronis iturum se dixit: seems to imply that Silanus anticipated a final *discessio* before a decision was reached. Gellius, 14.7.9 seems to assume that Varro laid down two alternative methods of arriving at a decision, *aut per discessionem* (division) *aut per singulorum sententias exquisitas* (*rogatio*), although he quotes two contemporary authorities, Tubero and Capito who maintained: *nullum senatus consultum fieri posse non discessione facta. Discessio,* however, was also used for an expression of opinion in the course of a debate, whereby a member might place himself by the side of a speaker instead of speaking himself upon the question (e.g. Livy, 27.34.7). On a fairly clear-cut issue, *rogatio* coupled with the groupings that took place in the course of a debate might have been sufficient for a final decision. On a complicated question, where opinion fluctuated with each major speech (cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 11.15), it could well become necessary to demand a final *discessio* in order to arrive at a definite decision. See further P. Willems, *Le sénat,* 2.178ff.; 194ff.; Ogilvie on Livy, 1.32.12.

Ti. Neronis: legate of Pompeius in the pirate war (Appian, *B. Mith.* 95; Florus, 1.41.9). His son Ti. Claudius Nero, quaestor in 48, commanded Caesar's fleet at Alexandria and in a debate on March 17, 44 B.C., proposed public honours for the tyrannicides (Suetonius, *Tib.* 4.1). The son of this quaestor became the emperor Tiberius. See *RE* III.2777(253).

praesidiis additis referundum censuerat: *abditis* of all

codices has been corrected in a few to *additis*. Wirz conjectured *abductis*, arguing that a second deliberation should take place in a calmer atmosphere in contrast to the precautions taken on this occasion (cf. 50.3, 51.19, 36; *in Cat.* 4.7-8). S.'s brevity has made the precise meaning obscure. We are not told where the guards were to be supplied or added. Since Nero's motion was similar to that of Caesar the likely meaning is that suggested by Appian (*BC* 2.5) viz. that extra guards would be added to ensure the safe custody of the arrested men until after the defeat of Catiline when a fresh deliberation over the fate of the arrested conspirators could take place.

50.5. **ubi ad eum ventum est:** if the presiding magistrate was following a reasonable order of precedence, Caesar, as *praetor designatus*, would speak after the consulars and before the *praetorii*. It seems probable that Ti. Nero spoke after Caesar and Cicero (cf. 52.1 *alius alii varie adsentiebantur*) but before Cato (cf. 53.1). If, as Willems (Le sénat, 1.458 n. 76, 2.181 n. 5) conjectures, Nero was a *praetorius* he would follow Caesar in order of precedence but precede Cato who was *tribunus designatus*. But there is no evidence to support Willems' conjecture.

huiusce modi verba locutus est: see on 20.1; the speech is to be regarded as Caesar's only in its general features—it is not a verbatim report. For the phrase *verba locutus est* cf. *BJ* 102.4; Cato, 73.15J.

Chs. 51-52: *The Debate of December 5*

Influenced most likely by the practice of Thucydides, who often summed up the essential factors of a situation by pairs of speeches reflecting the essential alternatives governing a decision, S. has chosen to present the essence of this crucial discussion by reporting only the speeches of Caesar and Cato. By so doing he crystallises the two major points of view concerning the problem facing the state, and at the same time indulges an artistic bent in providing a vivid portrait of two major personalities, an artistic aim which leads to the famous *synkrisis* of ch. 54.

We cannot say with certainty how closely these speeches, composed in a thoroughly Sallustian style, are related to the speeches which actually were delivered. Is appears from the synopses provided by Suetonius, *Jul.* 14.1 and Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 23 (accounts which seem to be independent of S.) that S.'s versions

are not far from the originals in their essential content; cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.7-8, *Att.* 12.21.1; Vell. Pat. 2.35.4. See bibliography cited on Catiline's speech (ch. 20) and add W. Schmid, *Gymnasium* 69 (1962) 336ff.; D. Ableitinger, *Festschrift Vretska*, Heidelberg 1970, 332-60.

51.1-8. *Exordium of Caesar's Speech*

Caesar's introduction indicates the essential characteristics and the aim of his speech. He attempts firstly to smooth the waves of emotional tension and to introduce an atmosphere of cool and rational objectivity. He makes a careful approach to his main thesis; he does not immediately refer to the juridical aspect of the case, but in a judiciously selective appeal to *mos maiorum*, to which he refers repeatedly, he underlines his two main points—that all feelings of anger, pity etc. should be laid aside; that they should above all beware of taking a decision which might injure the best interests of the state.

51.1. **omnis homines . . . vacuos esse decet:** a *sine ira et studio* concept found in various forms in many Greek and Roman historians (see Goodyear on Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.1.3) is here applied in a judicial context; cf. Thucydides, 3.42.1; Demosthenes, *Chers.* 1. Some maintain that this Caesar-Cato debate is modelled on the Cleon-Diodotus debate in Thucydides, 3.37ff. and 42ff. (e.g. Perrochat, 21; Avenarius, *SO* 33 (1957) 50; Patzer, *NJ* 116 (1941) 134f.); others consider that it is based on the Nicolaus-Gylippus debate from Ephorus which is reported in Diodorus, 13.20ff. (e.g. Theiler, *Festschr. Jacoby*, Leiden, 1956, 144ff.; Laqueur, *Hermes* 46 (1911), 347ff.). Throughout both speeches there are echoes of several possible models, such as Thucydides, Demosthenes, Lycurgus, Cato the Elder, and it is not possible to claim with certainty that S. has used one model to the exclusion of others. It may well be the case (cf. Appendix II) that S. is calling upon a knowledge which is the fruit of wide reading.

omnis homines: note the marked similarity with the opening words of the monograph. There is no MS conflict about the form *omnis* here, a fact which makes much less tenable my suggestion that S. might have used *omneis* for its archaic flavour. See on 1.1.

de rebus dubiis: see on 10.2 n. *dubias res.*

ab odio . . . vacuos: on *vacuus* with preposition cf. 14.4. It may be that S. is being anachronistic here. *Mansuetudo*, which is

stressed as an essential part of Caesar's character in ch. 54, was a feature rather of his later career. The quality was not conspicuous in his dealings with Catulus over the pontificate nor indeed in the early stages of his rise to power. If Caesar did actually use the words in his speech then it might be interpreted as an effort to dispel any suspicion of sympathy on his part for the cause of the conspirators.

51.2. **neque quisquam omnium:** *omnium* here is probably a rhetorical substitution for *umquam*; cf. Cicero, *pro Rosc. Com.* 18 *estne quisquam omnium mortalium* etc.

libidini simul et usui paruit: cf. Nepos, *Alcib.* 4.6; Cicero, *De imp. Cn. Pomp.* 60 which also illustrate the meaning "allow oneself to be governed" (cf. 2.7) which can be applied to *parere.* For the perfect tense (*paruit*) used in *sententia* see on *concupivit,* 11.3. A major plank of Caesar's argument is that *verum* in this case is synonymous with what is advantageous to the state.

51.3. **ubi intenderis ingenium:** this play on the concepts *ingenium-animus* and *lubido* recalls S.'s own point of view, cf. 2.5-6. See Appendix VII.

51.4. **magna mihi copia est memorandi:** a fusion of the two meanings of *copia*—"ability"; "abundance of material".

quae reges ... consuluerint: the stronger transmission *qui* should be retained here; we have then an elliptic relative clause—*eos reges atque populos qui* etc.—An unqualified *reges atque populi* is no proper contrast to *maiores nostri.*

recte atque ordine: a phrase also used by Livy, e.g. 24.31.7, 28.39.18, 30.17.12. For the coupling of an adverb and a noun used adverbially cf. *BJ* 113.1 *dolo an vere, Hist.* 1.104M *furtim aut celeritate.*

51.5. **bello Macedonico:** the war brought to a successful conclusion by Paulus Aemilius after the battle of Pydna, 168 B.C. Cf. Livy's summary, 45.9f.

Perse: Cicero and Sallust (cf. *BJ* 81.1, *Hist.* 4.69.7M) use the *Perses, Perse* form; Livy, Pliny, Justin, Eutropius prefer the *Perseus, Perseo* form.

Rhodiorum civitas ... advorsa nobis fuit: the Rhodians had been rewarded for the help they gave Rome in the war against Antiochus of Syria (189 B.C.) by a gift of the greater part of Lycia and Caria (Livy, 45.22.2). As the war against Perses dragged on and their commerce suffered, the Rhodians offered to negotiate

peace and even talked of joining the war against the power which refused to come to terms. Although they subsequently did what they could to placate the enraged Romans, they did not escape Roman wrath after the victory of Pydna. Cf. Livy, 45.25.4; Vell. Pat. 1.9.

inpunitos eos dimisere: not quite accurate. Rome did not declare war on Rhodes, but she stripped her of her holdings in Caria and Lycia and Rhodes' revenue was drastically reduced by the creation of a rival emporium at Delos.

The reason for Caesar's citation of the case of Rhodes is not immediately obvious. It is not simply a use of the rhetorical *topos* of citing historical examples. It involves a subtle reminder of a famous speech of Cato's ancestor, a reminder which would not be missed by his audience and which could place the younger Cato in an embarrassing position. Large sections of the Censor's speech are preserved in Gellius, 6.3 (= *HRR*, fr. 95; ORF² frr. 163-171). In his speech on behalf of the Rhodians the elder Cato argued for moderation and for delay before a decision was taken about the Rhodians (cf. Livy, 45.25.1). He reminds his audience of *superbia et ferocia* which tend to accompany success, points to the value of adversity as a teacher (Gellius, 6.3.14) and ridicules anger as a basis of decision (ibid. 5). This, then is Caesar's subtle way of counselling *misericordia*; by citing the elder Cato on preferring *usus* to *libido* he can also free himself from a charge that he is arguing from purely personal feelings and motives.

This reference to the Rhodians also raises a nice point about S.'s method of composition. The reference obviously has to do with the fact that Cato is to speak later. But did Caesar guess that Cato would speak and what line he would take? Or are the Rhodians S.'s addition? The latter is the more likely explanation. The point in common between this and the following illustration is that punishment must be appropriate to the character—'public image'—of the punisher.

51.6. **item bellis Punicis . . . quaerebant:** the reason for Caesar's referring to this alleged attitude of *maiores* is more immediately obvious. He is counselling against the influence of *ira*, and at the same time he is able to introduce a concept which becomes a major item of his whole appeal—the Senate's *dignitas* and *fama* as the leading council in the state. See further on 51.12ff., Carthaginian defections and Roman tolerance also reflect Cato's

Origines, where he insisted on consistent Carthaginian treachery (*HRR* fr. 84).

et in pace et per indutias: for the change of preposition cf. 52.15, where, however, the sense also seems to favour the change. Here the repetition of *in* would be the more awkward because of *in-dutiis*.

multa nefaria facinora: it was the fashion at Rome to attribute perfidy to the Carthaginians; cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 274V *dubius hostis*; Cicero, *Off.* 1.38 *Poeni foedifragi*; Virgil, *Aen.* 1.661 *quippe domum timet ambiguam Tyriosque bilinguis*; Horace, *Od.* 4.4.49 *perfidus Hannibal*; Livy, 21.4.9 *perfidia plus quam Punica.* However, there is little actual evidence of this in the history of the Punic wars. For the expression *nefaria facinora* cf. Cato, 39.12J.

nunquam ipsi: the facts do not bear this out. Roman guile and treachery were a major feature of the Third Punic War.

per occasionem: i.e. *quamvis occasio non deesset*; cf. Livy, 1.53.7, 22.15.5, 25.38.12.

magis quid . . . quaerebant: Livy, commenting on the senatorial edict with regard to Cotys, king of Thrace, remarks: *magis quid se dignum esset quam quid merito eius fieri posset, aestimaturum* (45.42.10). The same maxim occurs in Polybius, 15.4.10 and in Diodorus, 11.92.3.

dignum . . . iure: these words sum up the crux of Caesar's argument. He never really challenges the legality of the powers implied in *senatus consultum ultimum* (Appendix VI); he strives to achieve an alternative for the extreme penalty by appealing to the authority and sense of responsibility of the Senate as a body with the major duty of representing the state's *dignitas*. He points to the probability of laying down what he regards to be a dangerous precedent if they adhere too literally to what can be justified from the legal aspects of the situation. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.50.48 for similar sentiments. In other words, having regard to the nature of his audience, Caesar is propounding in a careful way the *popularis* attitude to the *s.c.u.*; the objection is not to the decree itself but to what is regarded as abuses of the powers conferred by the decree, in particular where such powers could be seen to clash with the *lex Sempronia*: *ne de capite civis iniussu populi iudicaretur*.

51.7. **providendum est . . . ne . . . valeat . . . neu . . . consulatis:** Jordan (*Krit. Beiträge*, 348) believes that we have here

traces of an old and stereotyped phrase which appears in fuller form in *Hist.* 1.77.9, 2.98.8, 3.48.13M.

scelus . . . dignitas . . . irae . . . famae: the parallelism of thought already expressed by *dignum . . . iure* is expanded and applied with specific reference to the present situation.

consulatis: cf. 6.6 n. *ingenium sapientia validum.*

51.8. **nam si digna poena . . . conparata sunt:** cf. Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 8-10. Uncertainty as to the meaning of this statement is due to a failure to recognise that Caesar is aware that an adequate penalty does exist, but since it involves the rare application of what are essentially extra-legal powers (Appendix VI) he is advising against a too hasty resort to these powers. He is not questioning the correctness of the procedure authorised by *senatus consultum ultimum.* Caesar explains his meaning in the course of his speech. His argument is not entirely convincing; by a sort of humbug application of philosophy he rejects death as an adequate penalty (sec. 20); yet he deliberately dwells upon the enormity of the crime (secs. 15, 17, 23). In short he is relying upon an appeal to the Senate's sense of its own importance and dignity to have the provisions of *s.c.u.* repealed, as it were, so that the provisions of such laws as *leges Porciae* and *lex Sempronia* can be applied or at least that the Roman practice which allowed for alternatives to the extreme punishment may be permitted. On this point see G. Wollerstorff, *Gymnasium* 58 (1951) 359ff.; his views are contested by P. Friling and other scholars in *Gymnasium* 59 (1952) 159ff.

digna poena: has a double application. With regard to the conspirators it is explained by *pro factis,* and has the meaning *idonea* or *iusta poena,* cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.12; Terence, *Hecyr.* 209. With regard to the Senate it is explained by the preceding sentences and is equivalent to *quae senatum populumque Romanum decet.* This double significance is made possible by the use of *pro* instead of the simple ablative.

novom consilium: Caesar is not advising, as Lycurgus (Leocr. 9) did, that the Senate should be οὐ μόνον ἀδικήματος δικαστάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ νομοθέτας. *novom* here has the meaning *inusitatum, insolens,* cf. Terence, *Eun.* 317, *Phorm.* 890; Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 1.1. His argument, therefore, is that to avoid unfortunate repercussions they should keep within the framework of existing laws. While he is always aware of the force of *s.c.u.*, he endeavours

to lead his hearers away from what support they might find in a reliance upon the provisions of the ultimate decree. Cato sees the point clearly enough and fiercely attacks the subtlety of Caesar's attempt to arouse fear in the Senate by references to possible political repercussions; cf. Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 23. See further on *novom genus poenae*, 51.17-18 and cf. J. S. Reid, *JRS* 1 (1911) 98f.

legibus conparata: a reference to laws *de maiestate* and *de vi*, from which the normal punishment was interdiction (*aqua et igni interdici*), i.e. exile. Cf. Cicero, *pro Sest.* 146, *Phil.* 1.23; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.12. There may also be an allusion to the specific provisions of *lex Sempronia* with its right of appeal to the people in the case of a death penalty.

51.9-15. *Argumentatio* (*i*)

The point of view expressed in the *exordium* in general terms is here applied to the case before them. By his references to previous speeches Caesar makes it clear that in his opinion the Senate is in the process of being swayed by personal motives of fear and outrage (*ira*). He makes it his first task to recall to them that sense of *dignitas* which marked the conduct of *maiores*.

51.9. **Plerique eorum . . . omnia compleri:** for the rhetorical device of unnecessarily listing the evils of war in order to obscure an opponent's real argument cf. Demosthenes, *Falsa Leg.* 88. The content of the list here may have suggested itself to S. from Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian* (11f.). Such descriptions, the prototype of which was the Fall of Troy (*Iliad* 22.62-5), were common among rhetoricians; the classic example is the lament for the destruction of Thebes, Aeschines, 3.156-7. For S.'s reserve with regard to horrific, erotic and similar material see K. Vretska, *SAWW* 229.4. Wien, 1955.

Caesar, repeating these well-worn clichés from previous speakers, is underlining the fact that such complaints anticipate events and are concerned largely with personal fate and fortune; personal feeling is not the best basis for wise decision.

conposite atque magnifice: the sense is explained by *BJ* 85.26 and 31, cf. *BC* 52.13. As such it expresses no censure but yet conveys a suspicion that the splendid form is to conceal a narrow selfishness of appeal.

casum: cf. 35.4.

matres familiarum: see on *filii familiarum*, 43.2.

conlubuissent: a most unusual personal use.

cruore atque luctu: *cruore* responds to *armis*, *luctu* to *cadaveribus*.

51.11. **gravius aequo habuere:** *habuere*, perfect in the sense of gnomic aorist, equivalent to *habere solent*; cf. 11.3 n. *concupivit. Aegre habere* is found in Livy (e.g. 7.5.7) but this seems to be the only place in classical Latin where *graviter habere* is used as equivalent to *aegre ferre*. See *Thes. LL.* 6.2305.21.

51.12. **qui demissi . . . cuncti mortales novere:** a widely used thought, the prototype of which is at Pindar, *Pyth.* 11.29-30; cf. Demosthenes, *Aristog.* 2.3; Xenophon, *Ages.* 5.6. See Theiler, *Festschr. Jacoby*, 152.

Caesar treats the Senate throughout as a corporate body and assigns to it those qualities of *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, *gloria* which in S.'s view were the foundations of Rome's greatness. He went near to success with this manoeuvre (52.1), but Cato, addressing the Senators as if they were all *piscinarii*, individuals to whom *corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit* (2.8, cf. 52.5f.), wins the day by playing upon individual fears.

vitam habent: *agunt* of many codices has intruded from what follows. *Vitam habent . . . aetatem agunt* forms a very good *variatio*. For a similar one see 4.1 with notes *ad loc.*

fama atque fortuna eorum pares sunt: see on 20.2 *virtus fidesque . . . spectata.*

qui magno imperio . . . novere: cf. Cicero's treatment of *fama* (*Off.* 2.31-51), where he says (*vir clarissimus*) *tamquam in clarissima luce versetur ita nullum obscurum potest nec dictum eius esse nec factum* (44). Cf. *BJ* 85.23.

51.13. **ita in maxuma fortuna minuma licentia:** cf. S.'s own views, 2.4-6.

neque studere neque odisse: such an absolute use of *studere* in the sense "show partiality" is rare. This is a secondary meaning originating with the noun *studium* as a synonym for *amor* and often so used as a contrast to *odium*. The absolute use is encouraged here by the difficulty of providing objects in different cases to the two verbs.

Caesar is back to one of his major points, the necessity to lay aside *ira*. His counsel here, which echoes S.'s own views in many ways, has led to a description of his speech as an expression of statesmanlike foresight. See Appendix VII.

51.15. **equidem ego:** the association of *equidem* with the first person singular in early Latin and later in Cicero and other good writers (Neue-Wagener, 2.963f.) led the Romans to believe that it was another form of *ego quidem* (cf. Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.576; Servius Auct. *ad Aen.* 1.335). Priscian (103.5K), influenced by its occurrence with persons other than the first singular, stated that it was not a composition of *ego* and *quidem*. Modern philologists (see Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. Etym. Wörterbuch*³, Heidelberg 1938, 1.411) do not agree on the derivation of the word. J. Wackernagel, *Beitr. z. gr. Akzent*, 22 = *Kl. Schr.* 2.1091, and others reject the *ego-quidem* etymology and suggest that *e* of *equidem* is an intensive particle such as occurs in *edurus*, *egelidus* etc. No decision on the derivation seems possible. If Wackernagel's conjecture is correct, the syntactical restriction of *equidem* to the first person singular must be due to *ego* being mistakenly heard in it. If the derivation from *ego quidem* is correct, the use of *equidem* with *ego* in writers like Sallust and Cicero must be a feature which arose when *ego* was no longer heard in it. S.'s usage pays no attention to possible etymology. Compare 51.20 with *BJ* 10.6, 85.26 and with 52.11, 52.16, 58.4.

omnis cruciatus minores quam facinora illorum esse: Caesar's proposition depends largely on his ability to convince the Senate that this crime goes beyond even the provisions implied in *s.c.u.* He refers again in secs. 23 and 25 to the enormity of the crime and the consequent inadequacy of any punishment, and it has been a major point in his *exordium*.

in hominibus inpiis: i.e. *quod ad homines inpios attinet*; cf. 51.35 *in M. Tullio*, 52.12 *in furibus*; Cicero, *Fam.* 12.22.4 *in Sempronio*.

51.16-24. *Argumentatio (ii)*

A basic weakness of Caesar's position is that he cannot contest the legality of the powers conferred by *s.c.u.* In his effort to win acceptance for his counter-proposal of prolonged imprisonment he reveals the weakness of his argument by his essay into philosophy in sec. 20, and his attempted *reductio ad absurdum* of what he claims to be the thinking behind Silanus' proposal of the death penalty (secs. 21-24). Nevertheless he does hit upon the feature which primarily determined the outcome of this debate, the danger which was felt to be present in the situation. If Caesar had desired

to attack the provisions of *s.c.u.* this was the one point on which he could have based a successful argument—the provisions of *s.c.u.* depended almost entirely on a feeling that the safety of the state was threatened (Appendix VI). Yet Caesar's reference to this point is brief and inadequate (sec. 19) and he devotes most of his time to a warning about the danger of creating a precedent by a decision to inflict the death penalty. Cato's handling of the theme of danger is much different and far more effective.

51.16. **D. Silanum . . . quae dixit:** refers to Silanus' first proposal, that the death penalty should be imposed. S. has already, (50.4) reported the effect on Silanus of Caesar's speech.

eos mores eam modestiam: see on *eas divitias*, 7.6.

51.17. **quid enim . . . crudele fieri potest?:** cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.11; *quae potest esse in tanta sceleris immanitate punienda crudelitas?*

51.18. **aut metus aut iniuria te subegit:** Caesar is being somewhat ambiguous here. He has already said that Silanus is not acting from personal motives, and thus *metus* and *iniuria* must be taken in a more general sense. The phrase probably means "the fear they have inspired (cf. 46.2) and the harm they have done". Nevertheless there is undoubtedly an implication that Silanus and the others are primarily influenced by personal feelings. Caesar treats too lightly the feelings implied by the word *metus*; it is a feeling which provides Cato with his strongest argument. On *subegit* see on 10.5.

consulem designatum: Caesar is hinting that Silanus in particular was fearful of a dangerous situation lasting into his year of office.

genus poenae novom: for the meaning of *novom* here see on *novom consilium* in sec. 8, an explanation which seems to be confirmed by Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.7: *atque hoc genus poenae saepe in improbos cives in hac re publica esse usurpatum recordatur.*

51.19. **de timore . . . sint in armis:** the reference to Cicero is not ironical; Caesar is stating facts and irony would not help his case. See L. Wohleb, *Phil. Woch.* 48 (1928) 1245.

51.20. **de poena:** Caesar concentrates on this point, but his argument, as already pointed out, is curiously inept, a verbose exposition of dialectic skill. This is mainly due to the fact that he has to argue about the *s.c.u.* before an audience generally unsympathetic to his views.

id quod res habet: see 11.3 n. *avaritia habet.*

in luctu atque miseriis mortem . . . locum esse: in a superficial way Caesar throws in the Epicurean doctrine concerning death, a doctrine stated at greater length by Lucretius, 3.670-1107. He may have been counting on the Epicurean beliefs of many of the Roman upper classes. Cato's reply to this in 52.13 reiterates strongly the Platonic Doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

51.21-24. **sed per deos inmortales . . . neglegeris:** Caesar now more clearly develops an argument concerning *provocatio*—the right of the condemned to appeal to the people. In doing so he touches upon a point which the Senate had always found difficult to defend. From a senatorial point of view *cives* who were declared *hostes* (cf. 50.3; Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.10) were no longer eligible to benefit from *provocatio*; popular opposition did not accept such legal niceties and fought each case in terms of laws such as the *lex Sempronia.* For his purpose Caesar dispenses with the crucial premise of whether the arrested men were *cives* or *hostes* and proceeds with an argument whose logic is based on the ignoring of this factor; if they have respected laws on *provocatio* connected with scourging, why are they considering ignoring them in the case of the death penalty?

51.21. **ut prius verberibus . . . animadvorteretur:** earlier laws, such as *lex Valeria* of 300 B.C., allowed appeal against flogging and execution. Caesar's use of *prius* suggests that he is referring to the traditional penalty of scourging plus execution and not to execution *more maiorum,* which included death by scourging (Suetonius, *Nero* 49.2; cf. Gellius, 17.21.24 = Nepos, *HRR* fr. 5).

51.22. **an quia lex Porcia vetat?:** there were three *leges Porciae* on *provocatio,* introduced probably about 198 to 195 B.C. We possess no full statement on the terms of these laws nor has full agreement subsequently been reached as to their content and purpose; cf. Greenidge, 321; Strachan-Davidson, *Problems* etc. 1.125; D. Kienast, *Cato der Zensor,* Heidelberg, 1954, 90-1; P. Garnsey, *JRS* 56 (1966) 167-8. Cicero (*Rep.* 2.54) states that they imposed severe sanctions on magistrates who neglected *provocatio.* According to Livy, 10.9.4, (a) *lex Porcia* provided a penal sanction if anyone flogged or executed a Roman citizen—*si quis verberasset necassetve.* Cf. Cicero, *pro Rab.* 8: *civibus aut verberatis aut necatis.*

Caesar's question supports Livy's statement. See A. H. M. Jones, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate*, Oxford, 1972, 22ff.

aliae leges: it seems from Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.10 that Caesar referred to the Sempronian law, but we do not know in what terms. The provisions of *lex Sempronia*, passed by C. Gracchus in 123 B.C., are stated by Cicero, *pro Rab.* 12. Caesar's references to statute laws are vague because they do not really affect the legal aspect of the decision. He is appealing to the innate reluctance of Romans to inflict the death penalty, and urging them not to embark upon a *novom* (*inusitatum*) *consilium*. On *provocatio* see also Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 44; J. Bleicken, *RE* XXIII.2444ff.; *Zeit Sav. Stiftung* 76 (1959) 324ff.; E. Staveley, *Historia* 3 (1954) 416ff.

non animam eripi sed exilium permitti iubent: Caesar seems to be trying to suggest that it is against the law not to permit exile.

51.23-24. **an quia gravius . . . sin quia levius:** the logic of the argument has broken down. Caesar begins (sec.21): "Death? Why not flogging as well? Because it is forbidden by statute? So is death". He then strives further to show the inconsistency of Silanus' position by a *complexio*, showing either of the two possibilities to be untenable: (i) Is flogging more severe than death? (ii) Is it less severe? But he confuses the subject of the two propositions, varying between 'flogging instead of death' and 'flogging as well as death'. *Gravius est* must refer to 'flogging as well as death', for that is the proposal under discussion—*prius verberibus*—but *levius* must refer to 'flogging instead of death', for no one could think that it was *levius* to be first flogged and then killed than to be simply killed.

51.24. **sin:** used without a preceding *si*, but the prior question: *an quia gravius . . . ?* has the same force as a conditional sentence.

qui convenit: a few codices read *quid* but the old ablative *qui* "how" was more likely to be replaced by *quid* than *quid* by *qui*. Cf. Plautus, *Poen.* 1208, *Pseud.* 866; Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 3.76.

neglegeris: the important MS. P has this reading, the rest have *neglexeris*. In *BJ* 40.1 two MSS. read *neglegisset*, a reading adopted by several editors. S. seems to use also an old perfect form *intellegit* in *BJ* 6.2; cf. the critical apparatus on *Hist.* 1.55.23M. See Diomedes (1.369.15K), Priscian (2.525.5K) on Macer's (*Annals* XVI, *HRR*.

fr. 22): *omnium nostrum neglegerit auctoritatem*; Neue-Wagener, 3.416.

51.25-36. *Argumentatio (iii)*

Caesar now comes to the major point of his speech—the danger of creating a precedent which could have disastrous repercussions. This, presumably, was the feature of his speech which had the greatest effect on his hearers (52.1). His argument remains, however, vague and ambiguous and the examples he uses are more designed to arouse fear and doubt in the Senate than to challenge the legality of the death penalty. He is reduced to a use of the rhetorical *topos* of *utilia ac necessaria* (Cicero, *Part. Orat.* 96), reinforced by warnings of the instability of fortune and the doubtful issues of the future.

51.25. **at enim:** these particles could point to the assumed protest of an opponent—"but, someone may say, why all this discussion, for who will blame . . . ?" Alternatively, it could simply mean: "But why am I saying all this?"

parricidas rei publicae: i.e. *hostes*. Cf. 31.8; Cicero, *in Vat.* 35. The objective genitive *rei publicae* (cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.29 *parricida civium*) must be a secondary development if the obscure first part of *parricida* is already an object.

tempus dies fortuna: vague terms, the more threatening in being less calculable, less foreseeable. *Tempus* is used perhaps in the sense of *pro tempore* "circumstances" as in 50.3, *BJ* 11.1, 70.3. *Dies* is time with the accent on change, cf. Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.34. The same expression is used by Livy, 2.45.2, cf. 22.39.12, 42.50.3; Cicero, *Fam.* 6.13.2. On *fortuna* see 10.1 n. *saevire fortuna.*

These nouns are peculiar subjects for *reprehendet*; one would at least expect a less positive connection with the inclusion of a word like *fortasse.* It is not completely inconceivable in view of the variants *est, erat* for *erit* that a verb such as *est* might have dropped out between *erit* and *tempus.*

51.26. **ceterum:** often has the meaning "but" in S., as later regularly in Tacitus. See on 20.6.

51.27. **omnia mala exempla . . . idoneos transfertur:** cf. Diodotus' warning on the danger of creating precedents, Thucydides, 3.47. For S.'s own thoughts on this subject see 11.4. The two examples (51.28ff., 32ff.) amplify *omnia mala exempla . . . sunt.* The second part of the thought is developed in 51.35f.

Exemplum is used here both with the meaning of a sample embodying a certain or desired quality and of precedent, denoting the result of an action. An action which represents a desired quality is used as a precedent for actions embodying less desirable qualities. See H. Kornhardt, *Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie*, Diss. Göttingen, 1936 and the review by O. Skutsch, *CR* 51 (1937) 86.

ex rebus bonis: the several variants of this passage (*bonis rebus, rebus domesticis, domesticis rebus*) make attractive the suggestion that even *rebus* is a gloss (Schöll, *Hermes* 11 (1876) 332) and that S. wrote *ex bonis* (i.e. *exemplis*). From the interpretation of *exemplum* discussed above it is clear that if something is *exemplum* it is a first happening.

sed ubi: *sed* seems to answer a thought such as "and should therefore be good". The sentence introduces a closer analysis of the preceding general statement.

ignaros eius: some codices read *ignaros cives*; *cives* does not really fit the sense, cf. 2.6. With *eius* understand *imperi*, cf. *BJ* 96.1.

novom illud exemplum: the primary sample of a desired action. Not the same use of *novom* as in 51.8, 18.

51.28-31. **Lacedaemonii . . . gravis poenas dedit:** a reference to the end of the Peloponnesian War; for the details cf. Xenophon, *Hell.* 2.3.2ff. This example seems to have been chosen by Caesar mainly for the purpose of arousing fear—an oligarchy acting in a despotic manner. In fact the example dose not completely fit in with his previous statements; in the case of the Thirty Tyrants it is not strictly a question of *imperium* passing into less experienced hands, nor is the feature of *indemnatum necare* strictly relevant to the issue here.

51.28. **devictis Atheniensibus . . . inposuere:** the verb is used absolutely, *devictis Atheniensibus* being ablative absolute, cf. *BJ* 100.3 *quasi nullo inposito.*

51.29-31. **ii primo coepere . . . gravis poenas dedit:** a *topos* originating with Xenophon, *Hell.* 2.3.12-21 and taken up by other writers on the Thirty, e.g. Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 35.4; Diodorus, 14.4.2-3.

51.29. **ea populus laetari:** for this rare construction of *laetari* with accusative of direct object cf. *BJ* 14.22; Cicero, *Fam.* 7.1.1; Ps-Virgil, *Culex* 322. Such a construction is easier with neuter pronouns than ordinary substantives.

51.30. **iuxta bonos et malos:** see on *iuxta*, 2.8.

51.32. **Damasippum:** L. Junius Brutus Damasippus, praetor in 82 and a leader of the Marians against Pompeius (Plutarch, *Pomp.* 7.1-2; cf. Diodorus, 38.9). He was responsible for the execution of Q. Mucius Scaevola, Pontifex Maximus, C. Papirius Carbo Arvina, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus and other opposing leaders (Cicero, *Fam.* 9.21.3; Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.7M; Livy, *Epit.* 86; Vell. Pat. 2.62.2; Val. Max. 9.2.3; Appian, *BC* 1.88; Orosius, 5.20.4). Damasippus was killed at Sulla's command after the battle at the Colline Gate (Appian, *BC* 1.92ff.; Cassius Dio, 30-35 fr. 109.4). See *RE* X.1025(58).

51.33. **vas aut vestimentum:** a common doublet, favoured by the alliteration in this context; cf. Cato, 72.22J.

in proscriptorum numero: on the Sullan proscriptions cf. Vell. Pat. 2.28.3; Appian, *BC* 1.95.

51.35. **haec ego:** Kurfess reads this with V; all other MSS. have *ego haec*. The order depends on whether *ego* or *haec* is more strongly emphasised. This we cannot decide and should therefore follow the stronger transmission. See also at 51.41, 52.36.

51.36. **potest alio tempore, alio consule . . . pro vero credi;** possibly a hint at Octavian's behaviour in 43 and the proscription after the *lex Titia*; cf. Syme, 122.

item: i.e. *pariter*; cf. 27.2.

hoc exemplo: cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 4.3.1: *quod exemplo fit, id etiam iure fieri putant, ipsi aliquid, atque adeo multa, addunt et afferunt de suo.* This is a good instance of the main statement; *per se* it is *bonum exemplum*, but it can lead to *mala exempla*.

per senatus decretum: *per* used to emphasise the means by which; cf. *BJ* 61.5, 64.3. See Introd. p. 20.

51.37-43. *Peroratio*

Caesor winds up a fairly rambling speech with an appeal in which the air of tentativeness with which he started is still to be detected. Since he cannot contest the basic legality of the death penalty under the terms of the *s.c.u.*, he can only convey the *popularis* objection to summary execution by an appeal to the well-known Roman reluctance to inflict the ultimate punishment on citizens.

51.37-38. **Maiores nostri . . . malebant:** on the Roman penchant for imitation, especially of things belonging to the art of war, cf. Polybius, 6.25.11. It was a widely recorded trait of the Roman character; cf. Diodorus, 5.40.1, 23.2.1; Athenaeus, 6.273d-e;

Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.1, *Rep.* 2.30; Varro, *apud* Servium *ad Aen.* 7.176; Walbank on Polybius, 1.20.15.

51.37. **neque consili neque audaciae:** a phrase which probably formed part of the traditional ingredients of *laus Romae* (cf. Livy, 3.12.7, 21.4.5, 21.57,3). Note *virtus atque sapientia maior illis fuit* in sec. 42 and cf. Cato's words in 52.21. Note also Polybius' use of ἀνδρεία and σύνεσις (*apud* Diodorus, 32.2) to explain Roman achievement. See Ogilvie on Livy, 3.12.7 and on *consilium* as a concept in this context H. Fuchs, *Mus. Helv.* 4 (1947) 166ff.

quo minus . . . imitarentur: *quominus* is used only twice again by S., viz. at 51.41 and *BJ* 38.8.

51.38. **arma atque tela:** see on 42.2.

militaria . . . magistratuum: *magistratuum* is necessary here and *militaria* is included for purposes of contrast.

ab Samnitibus: the Samnites were of Sabine origin; the names seem to be variants of each other; cf. J. Heurgon, *Rome et la Méditerranée Occidentale*, Paris, 1969, 55f.; *scutum* is called Samnite by Athenaeus, 6.273f., Sabine in origin by Plutarch, *Rom.* 21.1; cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 7.665. This willingness to profit by experience from foreign foes is indicated also by the imitation of the Spanish sword in the course of the Second Punic War (Suidas, *s.v.* μάχαιρα = Polybius, fr. 179—IV. 537, Büttner-Wobst), and of the *lorica hamata* from the Gauls (Varro, *LL* 5.116).

insignia . . . ab Tuscis pleraque: the other evidence we possess supports this statement—Livy, 1.8.2f.; Diodorus, 5.40.1; Strabo, 5.220; Dion. Hal. 3.61-2; Pliny, *NH* 8.195; Appian, *Pun.* 66. The Etruscan origin of the several insignia is doubted by the Franscisci, *Studi Etr.* 24 (1955) 25ff., defended by R. Lambrechts, *Essai sur les magistratures* etc., Brussels, 1959, 26ff. See Ogilvie on Livy, 1.8.1. Livy (1.8.2-3) lists as borrowings the twelve lictors, *sella curulis*, *toga praetexta*.

pleraque: probably "very many" not "most", as often in Livy and Tacitus. Compare 16.4 with 28.4.

51.39. **eodem illo tempore:** typically Sallustian vagueness in matters of chronology.

Graeciae morem imitati: this statement accurate as to facts, has aroused varied comment among scholars (e.g. Döderlein, *Philologus* 9, 579; Schöll, *Hermes* 9, 333). Caesar, who has already referred to two precedents (*ab Samnitibus* . . . *ab Tuscis*) generally regarded as substantially true, may have introduced this less

precise reference to the Greeks in an attempt to arouse prejudice against the carrying out of the death penalty by describing it as an un-Roman practice, an argument specifically aimed at Cato, the most Roman of Romans.

S.'s use of this phrase and his implied acceptance of the history behind the death penalty may perhaps be accounted for by the general belief that the Law of the Twelve Tables was drawn up under Greek influence (Livy, 3.31.8). Schöll suggested a borrowing from Varro, who in a book published in 43 dealt with Roman borrowings from the Greeks; cf. Servius, *ad Aen.* 7.176.

51.40. **multitudine civium factiones valuere:** a broad generalisation. Elsewhere, especially *BJ* 40ff., S. has attributed the rise of partisan strife to the removal of *metus hostilis*; cf. *BC* 10.1 *Carthago . . . interiit.*

circumveniri . . . coepere: on the construction of a passive infinitive with active *coepi*, see 12.1 *coepit.* For the word *circumveniri* cf. Catiline's complaint, 31.9. It may be that Caesar is hinting that the crime of conspiracy has been blown up out of all proportion. The one strength of this point of view is that they are dealing with a movement that has not yet actually threatened the state, a point which is vigorously rebutted by Cato (e.g. 52.4).

aliaeque leges . . . quibus legibus: for the repetition, solemn, pedantic, and somewhat archaic (legal phraseology?), cf. Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 28 (*ad eam rem . . . de qua re . . . in qua re*); Caesar, *BG* 1.49.1. For the facts cf. sec. 22.

51.41. **novom consilium**: see on 51.8.

hanc ego: should be preferred to *ego hanc* because of the stronger transmission. Cf. 51.35.

51.42 **profecto virtus . . . vix retinemus:** on this brief sketch of the essential difference, as S. saw it, between the ancient state of Roman greatness and the present stage of *luxuria* and *avaritia* see further on 52.19-21. For the general statement compare also Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.22-24 and see Ogilvie on Livy, 4.2.4.

illis fuit . . . quam in nobis: for the inconcinnity see Introd. p. 14f. In general, S. prefers dative with *esse* for mental qualities; compare 52.2 and 15.5. Here, however, *quam in nobis* may have been used because, however small the difference, it forms a heavier colon than *quam nobis*. For singular *fuit* see 12.1 n. *sequebatur.*

qui ex parvis opibus tantum imperium fecere: another well-known ingredient of *laus Romae*; cf. Cicero, *pro Rosc. Am.* 50,

pro Cael. 39; Livy, 6.41.8; Suetonius, *Aug.* 31; Val. Max. 1.10.

ea: refers to *imperium*; see Introd. p. 16 for *constructio ad sensum.* Repeated at 52.10.

51.43. **augeri exercitum**: cf. 6.3 n. *res ... aucta.*

sed ita censeo ... facturum: Caesar now puts a formal motion and his proposal accordingly contains words and phrases of a formulaic character. S. seems to have accepted Cicero's version of Caesar's proposal, viz. that he was recommending life imprisonment with no hope of release (*in Cat.* 4.7-8). Such a formulation was accepted also by Cassius Dio, 37, 36.1-2. The interpretation placed on Caesar's motion by other sources (Plutarch, *Cic.* 21.1; Appian, *BC* 2.6) seems to me more feasible, viz. that imprisonment was a temporary measure to be used until the revolt in Italy was crushed and a regular trial held. Throughout his speech Caesar had emphasised *mos maiorum* and the provisions of the Roman constitution. Imprisonment for life was contrary to Roman practice (cf. Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 960-963). If the latter is the correct version, Nero's motion (cf. 50.4) was substantially the same as Caesar's.

sed ita censeo: the official formula of a resolution cf. 52.36, *Hist.* 1.77.22M.

publicandas eorum pecunias: not merely their money but all their property, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.10 *publicationem bonorum.* If Caesar's motion was merely for postponement, as suggested above, their property could only be sequestrated, and Plutarch who uses the term 'confiscated' in his report of a postponement is guilty of an inaccuracy.

in vinculis habendos: in his interpretation of Caesar's proposal Cicero (*in Cat.* 7, 8, 10) adds more detail, such as imprisonment for life, heavy penalties for the municipalities if the prisoners should escape, the provision of adequate guards.

neu quis ... agat: if this was part of Caesar's motion it is in effect a recognition of the extra-legal powers of the *s.c.u.*; the question of *provocatio* did not enter into it.

cum populo agat: a legal formula, cf. Gellius, 13.16.3.

contra rem publicam: see on 50.3.

52.1. **dicundi finem fecit:** has an air of archaic solemnity; cf. Plautus, *Asin.* 605; Terence, *Andr.* 821. It appears to have been taken over as a technical term in rhetorical theory (Cicero, *Inv.* 1.33).

ceteri verbo alius alii varie adsentiebantur: we learn from Suetonius, *Jul.* 14.2; Plutarch, *Caes.* 8.1 that many of the leading Senators and others, including Cicero's brother, Quintus, were in favour of Caesar's motion. We are dealing with only two motions (i) that of Silanus and all who spoke before Caesar—the death penalty; (ii) that of Caesar and Nero—postponement. Even so, *alius alii* can still stand, cf. 54.1.

verbo .... adsentiebantur points to one method of showing support for a motion. Without rising to group behind a speaker of their choice (see on 50.4), or without making a formal speech in support, Senators could indicate approval from their seats; cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 5.2.9; Livy, 27.34.7. *Varie* indicates that there was still a division of opinion concerning the motions already put; it may also carry the implication of different reasons for the support of a specific motion.

M. Porcius Cato: surnamed in history Uticensis from his death at Utica, where he committed suicide after the battle of Thapsus in 46. The great-grandson of Cato the Censor, he was at this time *tribunus pl. designatus et adhuc admodum adulescens* (Vell. Pat. 2.35.3). His reputation for an unbending moral outlook coupled with the influence of a great name and a nexus of family connections gave him a political influence far outweighing his actual political activity. This is indicated by S's comparison of Caesar and Cato in chs. 53-4; see notes *ad loc.* See also R. Syme, *Roman Revolution* (1939) 21, 44; A. Afzelius, *Class. et Med.* 4 (1941) 100ff.; L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (1961) chs. VI, VIII.

huiusce modi orationem habuit: for *huiusce modi* see on 20.1, 50.5. Cicero, *pro Sest.* 61 gives his assessment of Cato's speech; for summaries see Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 23; Vell. Pat. 2.35.3f.

52.2-6. *Exordium of Cato's Speech*

Cato's introduction differs markedly from the conciliatory and somewhat tentative opening of Caesar's speech. He plunges *in medias res* and forcibly lays down the two major planks of his argument, the danger inherent in the situation and an appeal, based on this, to the individual hopes and fears of his hearers. His *exordium* is therefore closer to the ideal *exordium* as described by Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.318, where the argument is taken *ex ipsis visceribus causae.*

52.2-3. **Longe alia mihi ... consultare:** a close echo of Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.1 with the same emphasis on danger and on the opinion of others concerning it.

52.2. **Longe alia mihi:** the stronger transmission *mihi alia* would imply another *alia* before *quom sententias* etc., and would mean that Cato's opinion when he reflected on affairs differed from that aroused when he reflected on the sentiments of earlier speakers. *A lia mihi* (*cod.* V, supported by Servius, *ad Aen.* 1.13) contrasts his opinion to those of other speakers. Although the whole tone and force of the speech indicates that Cato had only one opinion and that an unyielding one, we must follow the stronger transmission, but without much confidence.

nonnullorum: the of ring disdain in this polemical anonymity is unmistakeable; see on *languentibus aliis*, 43.3.

52.3. **disseruisse ... de poena ... res autem monet:** the danger presented by the conspiracy is the major point throughout. This is not the time for discussion—*disserere* no doubt indicates thus early Cato's opinion of Caesar's speech—but the time for action. Note use of adverbial infinitives, *cavere* and *consultare* with *monet.* Cf. 5.9 n. *hortari ... repetere.*

patriae, parentibus: parents standing as *pars pro toto* for families. For the thought cf. Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 2; on the alliterative combination see Introd. p. 18 and cf. *BJ* 3.2, *Hist.* 4.69.17M.

aris atque focis: Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.24 makes it quite clear: *de vestris coniugibus ac liberis, de aris et focis, de fanis atque templis ... decernite.*

52.4. **nam cetera maleficia ... nihil fit reliqui victis:** cf. Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 126. Similar advice by the elder Cato is preserved in Vegetius, *Re Mil.* 1.13: *in aliis rebus ... si quid erratum est potest postmodum corrigi; proeliorum delicta emendationem non recipiunt cum poena statim sequatur errorem.*

Cato is aware of the effect of Caesar's vague references to laws such as *leges Porciae* on a Senate confused about the legality of the provisions of *s.c.u.* and aware of the very strong feeling for the right of *provocatio.* The only weakness in the consul's position is that he is forced to apply his extraordinary powers when the danger has not yet become fully tangible (Appendix VI). Cato therefore forcibly lays down the view that the danger is as real as if they were actually being attacked; cf. especially secs. 25, 35.

This sentence also displays a complexity of periodic structure unusual in S. and designed to give overriding emphasis to *hoc*: thus *ubi evenit* is logically antecedent to the main verb *implores*, while *nisi provideris* with its object clause *ne adcidat* is logically antecedent to both *ubi evenit* and to *implores*; the order chosen, with *nisi provideris* given an early position of emphasis, indicates the intensity of warning that Cato wishes to convey. On the omission of the causal particle with *capta urbe* see 17.7 n. *quia Cn. Pompeius*; Introd. p. 15.

nihil fit reliqui: see on 11.7 n. *nihil relicui ... fecere.* Read *relicui* here; I assume a misprint in Kurfess.

52.5 **sed, per deos inmortales ... capessite rem publicam:** the attitude to the Senate indicated by this appeal is in marked contrast to that of Caesar—see on 51.12f. Cato directs his appeal to where it would be most effective, the self interests of the individual listener. He does so in terms which strongly recall the words and viewpoint of S. himself, e.g. *domos*, cf. 12.3; *villas*, cf. 13.1; *signa, tabulas*, cf. 11.6. This has given rise to the view that Cato is throughout representative of S.'s judgement (Appendix VII).

expergiscimini ... capessite rem publicam: a strong call to action: *expergiscor* (take active interest in) in contrast to *nihil facere de*; *capesso* (begin to be active in politics) in contrast to *domos* etc. *pluris facere.*

52.6. **non agitur ... iniuriis:** for a similar sentiment cf. *BJ* 31.25. Cato returns to this idea again in sec. 12.

sociorum iniuriis: objective genitive. For the facts cf. 12.5; Cicero, *Fam.* 15.4.15.

in dubio: i.e. *dubia* or *in periculo*. Cf. Terence, *Andr.* 347. See 13.3 n. *in propatulo habere.*

52.7-12. *Argumentatio* (*i*)

The recurring theme of all sections of Cato's argumentation is the danger inherent in the conspiracy, a danger which is heightened throughout by the decline in private and public morality. Cato, aware of the disadvantage of having been so often, according to himself, a prophet of doom, has now to arouse his hearers to a danger which is real and pressing, and which threatens the very basis of their *luxuria* and *avaritia*.

52.7. **Saepenumero ... advorsos habeo:** *saepenumero patres*

conscripti is a typical opening to a speech; S. has placed the impassioned outburst of secs. 5-6 in front of a set piece.

At this time Cato was about 32 years old and had been in the Senate only a short time; since junior Senators were rarely called on to speak, *saepenumero* is an exaggeration. The anachronism which is revealed also in statements and sentiments appropriate to an elder statesman, e.g. 52.16 *eo magis refert* etc., may be the result of S.'s desire to make the speech thoroughly representative of the man's character, of his career as a whole, a point of view which is obviously present in the *synkrisis* of ch. 54. This air of elder statesmanship may also be partly due to the fact that S. is conscious throughout of the character and utterances of the elder Cato; this whole passage has a parallel in a speech of Cato the Censor in Livy, 34.4.1. For a series of correspondences between this speech and the concepts and phraseology from surviving speeches of Cato Censorius see R. Ullman, *La technique des discours dans Salluste, Tite-Live, et Tacite*, Oslo, 1927, 139.

ea causa: equivalent to *ea de causa* or *propter eam causam*. Cf. *BJ* 54.4, 80.4 *ea gratia*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.18.1 *qua causa.*

52.8. **qui...fecissem:** causal *qui.* An expression of the speaker's Stoicism, this also recalls a statement of the elder Cato preserved in Plutarch, *Cato Mai.* 8.9: καὶ συγγνώμην ἔφη διδόναι πᾶσι τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι πλὴν αὑτοῦ. The phrase *gratiam facere,* "to remit, overlook", is fairly rare. It is found in Plautus, *Cas.* 373, *Miles* 576, *Most.* 1130, 1168; Livy, 3.56.4 (Ogilvie's note).

animo meo: "inclination" as in 58.6 *animus ferat.* What is *animus* in Cato is *lubido* in others.

condonabam: *veniam dare,* with dative, as in *BJ* 27.2, indicating *cui condonatur*—thus *alterius lubidini* is equivalent to *alicui lubidinoso.*

52.9. **opulentia neglegentiam tolerabat:** cf. 53.5; Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.2.; Cicero, *Har. Resp.* 60. *Opulentia* is ablative; cf. 24.3, 37.7.

52.10. **bonisne an malis moribus:** *utrum...an* is only used twice by S., viz. *Hist.* 2.98.3, 4.69.16M. He normally uses *ne...an* or *an* alone.

haec: refers to *imperium*; see on 51.42 n. *ea.*

an nobiscum una hostium futura sint: cf. the close parallel in Livy, 21.43.6: *id omne vestrum cum ipsis dominis futurum est.*

52.11. **hic mihi quisquam...nominat:** for the use of

quisquam cf. 5.3, 14.7, *BJ* 11.7. Some editors (e.g. Ernout) read this sentence as a question in order better to imply the negative sense with which *quisquam* should be used. This seems inescapable; a statement would require *quidam*.

equidem: see on 51.15.

nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus etc.: cf. Thucydides, 3.82.4. The debasement of political vocabulary is a well-known *topos*—e.g. Plato, *Rep.* 560e; Isocrates, *Panath.* 131; Plutarch, *Alcib.* 16.3, *Solon* 15.3. It is a constant theme in this monograph (cf. Knoche, *Philol.* Suppl. 27.3 (1935) 26ff.) and here once more Cato is made to express a Sallustian concept; cf. 12.1, 38.3 and see notes on Catiline's manipulation of traditional concepts in ch. 20.

The use of *mansuetudo, misericordia, largiri* in conjunction with this statement on perversion of vocabulary and the fact that these named qualities are applied to Caesar in ch. 54 have led to some daring conclusions on the part of commentators. See Appendix VII.

52.12. **sint sane ... in ruribus aerari:** an ironic concession in the same spirit as that of his great-grandfather: cf. Cato, 69.1J: *fures privatorum furtorum in nervo atque in compedibus aetatem agunt, fures publici in auro atque in purpura.*

liberalis ex sociorum fortunis: cf. 20.7, *BJ* 31.9, 31.25.

in furibus: see on *in hominibus inpiis*, 51.15. *Misericordes* would normally be used with *in* and the accusative.

ne illi ... largiantur: i.e. *dummodo ne*, cf. Livy, 36.1.8. Several MSS have *illis* here. This would have to refer grammatically to *fures aerari* but this is certainly not Cato's meaning. The subject "those people" makes excellent sense after the indefinite *sint*.

paucis sceleratis ... bonos omnis: note the chiastic arrangement.

perditum eant: for the use of the supine see on 36.4. For the sentiment cf. *BJ* 31.27.

52.13-18. *Argumentatio* (*ii*)

In Caesar's speech an attack on the view represented by Silanus formed a major point of his argument. Cato's speech must obviously be organised to refute Caesar's argument. Here, using the weapon of irony, which is indicated by such words as *disseruit,*

videlicet and the parenthetic use of *credo*, an irony which also carries with it an undercurrent of suspicion concerning C~~ea~~sar's ae motives, Cato deals with two of Caesar's points, the question of death as a penalty and the depreciation of the element of danger.

52.13. **Bene et composite... habere:** *bene et composite* is not necessarily ironical here (cf. on 51.9), but the parenthetic *credo* which follows (cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.5; Caesar, *BC* 2.31.7, 2.32.11, 3.70.1; Horace, *Sat.* 2.2.90) shows that irony is the weapon chosen to combat Caesar's argument concerning death. Cato dismisses Caesar's view with a simple reference to a widespread folk-belief (cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.8.).

divorso itinere: the idea of two roads is part of the tradition of Hades, an element of the Orphic-Pythagorean doctrine of life after death. Thus the myth in Plato, *Gorg.* 524a; cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 6.540f., on which see Norden, *Aen. Buch VI.*

52.14. **itaque censuit:** Cato selects only parts of the motive behind Caesar's proposal. He does not even discuss the aspect of legality which Caesar had touched upon with elaborate circumlocution; for Cato the legal aspect is irrefutable—the conspirators are *hostes* (52.10, 25) and are to be treated as such (52.36).

videlicet timens: elaborate irony here, especially in the use of *timens*. Cato imputes to Caesar, incorrectly, a specific motive, the neutralisation of the conspirators, and on this basis proceeds to criticise Caesar's proposal. He uses against him the same trick of dialectic, the weapon of ambiguity which Caesar had used against Silanus.

52.15 **quasi... et non:** use of *et non* after *quasi* or *si* strengthens the note of false supposition in the first colon. Cf. *BJ* 4.8.

in urbe et non per totam Italiam: see on 51.6 *et in pace* etc.

52.16 **vanum... consilium:** cf. Ennius, *Sc.* 378V; Livy, 37.28.9.

si in tanto omnium metu... atque vobis timere: cf. Demosthenes, *Phil.* 4.34. The dialectic skill of this argument is concentrated in *solus*. Cato evidently had Caesar in mind when he talked about *mansuetudo et misericordia* in sec. 11 and suggested that these and other terms no longer stood for the traditional qualities they were supposed to represent. Here there is a more obvious casting of suspicion at Caesar's motive and his role, a device which enables Cato to heighten the fears of his audience, a feeling which he further inflames by his immediately following remark concerning the army of Catiline.

52.17. **qua re:** a repetition of *quare* of the preceding sentence. Cato is represented by S. as not so much interested in style as in vehemence of warning.

quom ... de omnibus coniuratis decernere: cf. Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 9. Cato emphasises the danger by repeated references to the connection between the prisoners and the conspirators still at large both inside and outside Rome, a danger coupled with the concept of war; cf. secs. 3, 4, 23, 25-7, 33, 35-6. In contrast, Caesar never mentions this factor except in his final sentence.

statuetis: a juridical word, cf. Caesar, *BG* 1.19.5.

52.18. **adtentius:** *intentius*, the reading of V and a correcting hand in P, is a more appropriate word in this context and should be accepted.

si paulum modo: the adversative particle has been omitted. Many codices have *paululum modo*, an expression not attested elsewhere; *paululum* by itself is a possibility.

languere: the full meaning of this word appears in the peroration (sec. 28f), where it is expressed as *mollitia animi* which inhibits action and the exercise of wisdom, the essential ingredients, as S. stressed in his prologue, of *virtus Romana.*

iam omnes feroces aderunt: *iam* equivalent to *statim*, cf. Plautus, *Aul.* 89, *Epid.* 257; Terence, *Eun.* 765; Horace, *Sat.* 1.1.16; Cicero, *Att.* 7.20.2. *Feroces* is used predicatively with *aderunt* which = "will attack", cf. 6.4. *aberant*, *BJ* 50.4.

52.19-23. *Digressio*

Caesar had repeatedly, if not always with strict relevance, referred to *mos maiorum* in order to boost his argument for leniency and to flatter the Senate into an outlook that they as a body were the upholders of a great tradition. Cato now takes time to attack this assumption and he does so in terms which recall vividly S.'s own strictures on contemporary degeneration.

52.19. **rem publicam ex parva magnam fecisse:** see on 51.42.

52.20. **quippe sociorum** etc.: for the general thought cf. Demosthenes, *Phil.* 3.40. For *quippe* see on 11.8.

52.21. **sed alia fuere ... lubidini obnoxius:** the thought here is thoroughly Sallustian. On *domi industria* etc. cf. 6.5, 7.4, 8.5, 9.1, 3, 5, 10.2. For the thought in general cf. Demosthenes, *Olyn.* 3.26-9; for the framework of the antithesis cf. *id. Phil.* 3.36: ἦν τι τότε . . . ὃ νῦν οὐκ ἔστιν . . . νῦν δέ . . .

quae ... quae: do not introduce co-ordinate relative clauses; the first *quae* defines, the second predicates *alia fuere*.

quae nobis nulla sunt: S. uses *nullus* to negative a number of concepts, as if to say *quae omnia desunt*. *Non* would have negatived only the verb and made it equivalent to *desunt*, cf. *BJ* 86.3, *Hist.* 1.55.9M. His usage may have been influenced by the idiom of earlier Latin which also uses *nullus* to negative a verb, e.g. Plautus, *Bacch.* 90, *Rud.* 143.

animus in consulendo liber: cf. 6.6. n. *ingenium sapientia validum*.

52.22. **pro his ... ambitio possidet:** an echo of Sallustian concepts, cf. 10.2-5, 11.2, 12.1-2.

publice egestatem, privatim opulentiam: a contrast also drawn by Horace, *Od.* 2.15.13.

omnia virtutis praemia ambitio possidet: S. has already given his interpretation of this concept: see notes on 2,9, 11.1-2. Cf. Cicero, *pro Mil.* 97 and for illustrations *BJ* 31.16, 85.42. The phrase *virtutis praemia* is one which appears regularly in the language of historiography. It appears, e.g. in Thucydides, 2.46 and Livy uses it to denote tenure of official positions. The use by Dion. Hal. 8.29.3 is significant: τὰ μὲν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἆθλα ἡ κακία φέρεται. It is probable that Cato was the source of S.'s adoption of the phrase; cf. Cato, 35.3, 39.3, 50.6, 107.10J.

52.23. **eo fit ut ... fiat:** *eo* taking up *ubi* is peculiar; but cf. 20.3, 52.11. It would be normal if preceded by a sentence which is not subordinate.

in vacuam rem publicam: *vacuus*, "helpless, without a master", a legal phrase, cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.40; the meaning is brought out by different words in *BJ* 41.5 *res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata*. The whole phrase became part of the language of historiography, e.g. Livy, 3.40.10, 23.2.7; see Heraeus on Tacitus *Hist.* 2.14.1 *vacuo mari*.

52.24-36. *Peroratio*

In a long peroration Cato recapitulates the few points of his argument, the crime, the danger, the attitude of the individual Senators. He takes up and ridicules the advice on *misericordia* and *mansuetudo* of Caesar, sums up *mos maiorum* with one simple example and ends as he began with the note of urgency demanded by the danger inherent in the situation.

52.24. **coniuravere . . . incendere:** the infinitive is best taken as a Grecism, the use of the infinitive to explain an intention or plan; the existing Latin usage of *velle* would facilitate by analogy the introduction of such Grecisms. Cf. Horace, *Od.* 1.15.7 *coniurata tuas rumpere nuptias.*

Gallorum gentem: used, deliberately perhaps, instead of *Allobroges.* For the force of the name *Galli* cf. 40.1, *BJ* 114.2, Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.22, 4.12.

supra caput est: a phrase frequently used for imminent danger; cf. Cicero, *pro Mur.* 79, *Q. fr.* 1.2.6; Livy, 3.17.2 (Ogilvie's note).

52.25. **deprensis hostibus:** not ablative absolute as in 46.2. It can be explained as an extension of instrumental ablative, cf. Cicero, 2*Verr.* 2.40 *quid hoc homine facias?* It could also be dative, cf. Cicero, *pro Caec.* 30 *quid huic tu homini facias?* Cf. also Cicero, *Acad.* 2.115; Nepos, *Ages.* 4.6.

52.26. **misereamini censeo** etc.: a jussive subjunctive. Cf. Demosthenes, *Fals. Leg.* 283. Irony is a leading element throughout the peroration, directed both against the assumptions of Caesar and against the lack of civic courage which Cato is afraid the Senate may display.

adulescentuli: see on *adulescentulus*, 3.3.

etiam armatos: against Caesar's proposal (51.43). Cato believes he has disposed of Caesar's argument on safeguards by his dialectic skill in secs. 14ff.

52.27. **ne . . . convortat:** *ne* here has been explained either as equivalent to *dummodo ne* as in 52.12, or, less attractively, as *ne* meaning "truly" (*nae*), which is always followed by a pronoun (Kühner-Stegmann, 1.795f.). *ne* here (possibly in 52.12) is optative: "let not. . . .".

52.28. **scilicet res ipsa . . . servavere:** cf. Demosthenes, *Phil.* 3.35, who speaks of Athenian internal squabbles which blind them to the threat posed by Philip of Macedon.

inertia et mollitia: for the phrase cf. Livy, 5.6.5. On the meaning see on *languescere*, sec. 18.

52.29. **non votis . . . irati infestique sunt:** for the general idea concerning the help of the gods cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.* 1.6.5.

vigilando, agundo . . . prospere omnia cedunt: a repetition of Sallustian concepts on the quality and type of ancient Roman *virtus*; cf. 2.5, *BJ* 1.3, 63.2. This quality of active *virtus* is denied to Cato in *Ep. ad Caes.* 2.9.3; it is the most prominent

of the qualities ascribed to Caesar in the comparison in ch. 54.

prospere . . . cedunt: Jordan retains *prospera*, strongly supported in the MSS; at 26.5 and *BJ* 63.1 *prospere* is an undisputed reading. In 26.5 S. also uses *aspera foedaque evenerant*. But there is a difference of usage between *evenio* and *cedo*, caused by the difference in meaning: with *evenio* either the action or the result may be qualified, with *cedo* only the action; cf. *BJ* 20.5.

52.30. **apud maiores nostros . . . necari iussit:** use of an example from the past to raise invidious comparison with a contemporary situation was a widely used rhetorical device. There is a close parallel to this particular situation in Demosthenes, *Fals. Leg.* 269-72; cf. Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 111 and 116; Demosthenes, *Aristoc.* 204f.

Cato, aware of the effect of Caesar's references to *mos maiorum*, applies the same device in a more telling way by referring to the proverbial *Manliana imperia* (Livy, 8.7.22; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, s.v. *Manlius*). The expression found a firm place in historiography, cf. Livy, 8.6.16, 7.12.12, 23.47.1. See R. G. M. Nisbet, *CQ* 9 (1959) 73. The attitude of Cato here, which reflects that of S. himself (9.4), is a different one from the revulsion at this cruelty which Livy reports at 8.12.1; cf. Claudian, *IV Cons. Hon.* 403: *Torquati despice mores*. Perhaps Cato's attitude has something of the flavour of scoring a rhetorical point such as marks Cicero's *nemo reprehendit* in *pro Sulla*, 32; see O. Skutsch, *CQ* 10 (1960) 192f.

A. Manlius Torquatus bello Gallico: there is a double mistake here. According to such authorities as Cicero, *Off.* 3.112, *Fin.* 1.23; Gellius, 9.13; Livy, 8.7; Florus, 1.8-9, the name was Titus Manlius and it was not in the Gallic War (361 B.C.) but in the Latin War (340) that this incident occurred. It was in the Gallic War (Livy, 7.10) that Titus won the cognomen Torquatus and S. may have confused the wars; Dion. Hal. 8.79 follows the Sallustian version. The Manlius story was particularly liable to distortion and embellishment. Livy, 4.29.5 tells of similar incidents connected with the name of A. Postumius Tubertus, but warns of the possible duplication and the strength of the tradition of *Manliana imperia*.

52.31. **parricidis:** see on 31.8.

videlicet cetera vita . . . obstabat: the irony of *videlicet* is obvious. For *obstat*, "to make amends" cf. Livy, 1.26.5 *recens meritum facto obstabat*.

52.32. **verum parcite** etc.: cf. Demosthenes, *Falsa Leg.* 219-20 for a similar ironical recommendation.

pudicitiae etc.: for the implication cf. 14.7.

dis aut hominibus: a polar expression (Introd. p. 16).

52.33. **adulescentiae:** the irony is quite strong, cf. 17.3 n. *Cethegus. Nisi iterum* could refer to his activity in the party of Marius in the conflict with Sulla; some take it to imply that Cethegus was implicated in the so-called *First Catilinarian Conspiracy.* In *pro Sulla,* 70 Cicero hints that Cethegus had gone to Spain during the Sertorian War to murder Metellus Pius. We are told by Ampelius (*Liber Memorialis* 31) that Cethegus' own brother voted for his execution.

52.34. **nam quid . . . loquar?:** marks a rhetorical transition as in 13.1: *nam quid ea memorem.* The irony is continued in *quibus si quicquam . . . fuisset*—these men are merely guilty of want of reflection.

Gabinio Statilio: cod. V retains the order of names found elsewhere in the monograph, i.e. 17.4, 43.2, 46.3, 55.6.

52.35. **postremo . . . undique circumventi sumus:** Cato repeats the basic theme of his speech—the need for the severest measures if they are to counteract the latent danger. For a similar line of thought cf. Demosthenes, *Phil.* 3.53; *Chers.* 61.

peccato: i.e. *errori in iudicando et consulendo* (Kritz).

Catilina cum exercitu faucibus urget: a metaphor used concerning those so threatened by danger that there is no room for escape. It is fairly common, e.g. Plautus, *Cas.* 943; Cicero, pro Cluent. 84; Val. Max. 5.3.2. *Faucibus* should be taken as ablative on the analogy of *faucibus teneri* (Plautus, *loc. cit.*); it could possibly be dative after *urget* on a bold analogy of *instat.*

in sinu urbis: may ultimately be pointing to the Senate, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.5 *intra moenia atque adeo in senatu.*

neque parari . . . occulte: the prevailing air of suspicion, indicated by the open accusations against Crassus and the attempt to implicate Caesar, is not without foundation. Catiline had his supporters even in the ranks of the Senate.

52.36. **ego ita:** *ita ego* should be read with the majority of the MSS; see on 51.35 *haec ego.* Similarly *maxuma* rather than *summa* (*pericula*).

de confessis . . . supplicium sumundum: Cato's opinion on the legal aspects of this case is quite clear (cf. Appendix VI). The

punishment should be death as distinct from exile, the normal outcome of action in the jurycourts. Secondly, there is no question of technical court procedure; the case comes under the extra-legal powers conferred by *s.c.u.* On the technical term *confessis* cf. Livy, 21.18.6; on *manufestis* (cf. 41.5) Gellius, 11.18.11. Such cases lay outside the right of *provocatio* and sanctioned the infliction of summary justice. There was no case, therefore, for the application of *leges Porciae* or *lex Sempronia*. On the technical points of law involved here see Zümpt, *Criminalrecht*, 1.2.170ff.; Greenidge, App. III.

Chs. 53-54. *Digressio: Caesar and Cato compared*

The connection between these two chapters, by which ch. 53 forms the basis for the actual comparison in ch. 54, the relevance of the speeches of the two men to the content of this comparison, and the extent to which Sallust's own judgement is reflected in his description are points discussed in Appendix VII.

53.1. **senatus magna pars . . . senati decretum:** on the forms of the genitive of *senatus* see on 30.3.

virtutem animi ad caelum ferunt: cf. 48.1. Note Cicero, *pro Arch.* 22: (*apud Ennium*) *in caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.34.4, referring to the lost *Laus Catonis* of Cicero: *quo Catonem caelo aequavit.* Cf. also Virgil, *Aen.* 1.260. 6.823.

clarus atque magnus: a favourite combination of S., e.g. 54.2, *BJ* 92.1, *Hist.* 1.55.1M. It occurs also in the opening words of Cato's *Origines* (cf. Cicero, *pro Planc.* 66).

sicuti ille censuerat: S. omits to mention that others spoke after Cato, e.g. Caesar for a second time (Plutarch, *Cic.* 21); cf. Vell. Pat. 2.35.3: *paene inter ultimos interrogatus.* However, it is undoubted that Cato's was the crucial speech for the proposal of the death penalty; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 12.21.1.

53.2. **Sed mihi multa legenti** etc.: this and the following sentences form a more personally expressed summary of what has already been said in chs. 6-13. The close connection with the thought of 52.19ff. and with S.'s extended treatment of *virtus* underlines once again a major objective of the writer—to place the conspiracy in all its aspects in close relationship with the leading theme of his monograph, *virtus* as the cause of Rome's greatness.

sed: for the connective force of *sed* cf. 1.2, 2.9, 3.3 *et saepe.*

mihi multa legenti multa audienti: anaphora takes the place

of a connective particle. Cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 1.1 *cogitanti mihi saepenumero et memoria vetera repetenti*, of which (V. Lundström, *Eranos* 15 (1915) 6) there were many imitations, e.g. Minucius Felix, 1.1; Apuleius, *de Mundo*, 1. S.'s reading extended beyond Roman history. It is clear that his knowledge of Greek literature, especially the Greek orators, was extensive, far deeper than would be acquired in the course of normal Roman rhetorical training and practice.

quae populus . . . fecit: indicative of a fact, cf. *BJ* 4.4.

mari atque terra: Dräger, *Hist. Syntax*², 2.65 lists some eight variations of the usual *terra marique.* S.'s avoidance of the traditional phrase here is no doubt influenced by his desire to avoid repetition of *-que* of the immediately preceding *militiaeque.*

tanta negotia sustinuisset: on the appropriateness of *sustinere* to convey the requisite implication of activity and endurance, cf. Cicero, *Off.* 1.124, *Fam.* 2.1.2, 5.5.3.

53.3. **sciebam saepenumero . . . ante Romanos fuisse:** cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 1.1, quoted above, in which *saepenumero* occurs. With such an introductory statement in mind, S. has transferred *saepenumero* to a different place; see on 52.7.

sciebam . . . contendisse: for similar omission of accus. in an accus. and infin. construction cf. 17.7 (*voluisse*), *BJ* 21.4, 22.2, *Hist.* 1.77.18M.

legionibus hostium: Roman technical terms are applied to non-Roman armies also in *BJ* 49.2, 79.4. Cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 217f., 363; Livy, 3.3.3. The source of S.'s usage may well have been Cato who uses *legio* of a non-Roman army in a very similar context, 26.5J.

parvis copiis: not a repetition of *parva manu; copiis* refers to resources, implied also in *opulentis.* Cf. 35.3, 48.2.

fortunae violentiam: the examples S. has just quoted are an expression of *domi industria . . . animus in consulendo liber* etc. 52.21. Because of these qualities a Roman does not have to rely on good luck; he grapples courageously with his destiny. See on *fortuna*, 10.1.

toleravisse: the meaning as in 37.7 *toleraverat*, and often in S.

facundia: this word, like *opulentia*, occurs only once in *Bell. Cat.*, several times in *Bell. Jug.* An archaic and colloquial word, it is not found in Cicero or in Caesar.

gloria belli Gallos: cf. *BJ* 114.2. See on *gens Gallica bellicosa*, 40.1.

ante Romanos fuisse: for such a use of the preposition, a colloquial substitute for *praestitisse Romanis*, cf. Livy, 35.14.11; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.27.1 (Goodyear's note), 13.54.3, *Hist.* 2.76.5. The construction does not occur in Cicero or Caesar.

53.4 **paucorum civium:** the general thought is present in Plato, *Menex.* 240e, but S. may have derived his view from Cato, cf. Cicero, *Rep.* 2.1ff.

patravisse: see on *patratum*, 18.8.

paucitas: an unusual word for *pauci*; a usage caused by the figure which begins with *paupertas*.

53.5. **luxu atque desidia:** cf. *BJ* 2.4, 6.1. This was also a Catonic combination, cf. Plutarch, *Cato Mai.* 16.5.

magnitudine sui: all MSS have *sua* which should be retained. *sui*, which Kurfess accepts from Augustine (*Civ. Dei* 5.12) could, however, point to an early corruption, it being more likely that *sua* should arise out of *sui* than vice-versa.

sicuti effeta <esset> partu: a much disputed passage which has evoked a variety of conjectural emendation. The common reading of all the best MSS is *sicuti effeta parentum.* Dietsch proposed to supply *aetate* to go with *effeta*, Klimscha (*Progr. Kremsier*, 1882, 19) suggested *virtute*; palaeographically the most satisfactory conjecture is Ritschl's (*Rh. Mus.* 1866, 316) *parentum* <*vi*>. Wirz (*Zeitschr. f. Gymnasialwesen*, 1877, 283) proposed to insert *esset* before *effeta* and to strike out *parentum* as a gloss. Ernout accepts the conjecture of Kunze (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 39 (1903) 1243ff.) *sicut* <*esset*> *effeta pariendo.* Kurfess prints his own conjecture (*Phil. Woch.* 38 (1937) 1165) *sicuti effeta* <*esset*> *partu.*

Jordan accepted *sicuti effeta parente* of two *codices recentiores*—his claim that *interpolati, vel omnes vel aliquot,* have *parente* is incorrect. This reading, which I find the most convincing of the versions proposed, seems to be supported by Pliny, *Ep.* 6.21: *neque enim quasi lassa et effeta natura ut nihil iam laudabile pariat.* Further, *sicuti* with ablative absolute is a construction common in Caesar and Livy, though it does not occur elsewhere in S., the nearest equivalent being at *BJ* 100.3 *quasi nullo inposito.*

virtute magnus: possibly a covert reference to Pompeius Magnus.

53.6. **viri duo:** recalls strongly the words of Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.26: *in hac re publica duos cives exstitisse.* Cicero is referring to

himself and Pompeius; cf. *ibid.* 2.11. S.'s choice from practically the same generation is different.

quoniam res obtulerat: see on *res ipsa hortari videtur,* 5.9.

obtulerat . . . fuit: these tenses as with *lubuit, sciebam, cognoverat* etc. above, show S. referring in an epistolary tense to the period before he started on the actual task of writing.

quin . . . aperirem: this use of *quin* (cf. 39.4) is unusual. It may be explained by assuming that the whole sentence *praeterire non fuit consilium* is equivalent to negative *praeterire.* Elsewhere S. uses *aperire* in the common meaning of *ostendere, patefacere,* e.g. 22.2, 41.4, 45.1. Here it has the meaning *illustrare* (*Thes. LL.* 2.218. 18ff.); cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 16-17.

Ch. 54.: one of the most discussed passages in S., particularly because of the historical viewpoint which many commentators believe can be detected in it (Appendix VII). Apart from this aspect, the chapter is an outstanding example of major features of Sallustian style — his brevity, his use of antithesis, his ability to paint a powerful picture with an asyndetic list of well-chosen nouns, features which confirm and illustrate the influence of Thucydides.

54.1. **igitur iis genus . . . sed alia alii:** S. starts by asserting that Caesar and Cato really were comparable, in that neither possessed any advantage of birth, age or endowment over the other. The rest of the chapter is then largely concerned with a comparison in respect of *gloria* and not of *virtus* in its entirety as he had described it in his introduction. That is to say he takes for granted the element of *ingenium* contained in *magnitudo animi* and *eloquentia* as a function of *ingenium.* He is solely concerned with the different ways in which these men set about the attaining of *gloria* and to what extent this end product of their *virtus* proved valuable, if at all, to themselves and to the state.

genus: Cato was a member of the plebeian *gens Porcia,* Caesar of the partrician Julian *gens.* But the achievements and eminence of Cato the Censor had conferred a dignity on the plebeian Porcii which rivalled that of the Julii.

aetas: during the conspiracy Cato was 32-33 years old, Caesar about 37. Cf. 52.1, 49.2.

eloquentia: regarded by S. as a function of *ingenium*; cf. his treatment of Sempronia in ch. 25, *BJ* 4.1. Thus Cicero, *Brut.* 59 *ut enim hominis decus ingenium, sic ipsius ingenii lumen est eloquentia.* Since it is ascribed to Catiline (5.4), it is not necessarily a guarantee

of *ingenium bonum* which would employ *eloquentia* for the production of *egregia facinora* and thus achieve *gloria*. In itself, therefore, *eloquentia* is not a reliable yardstick. On Caesar's *eloquentia* cf. Quintilian, 10.1.114; on Cato's, Cicero, *Brut.* 118.

magnitudo animi: occurs only here in S. It was one of the chief qualities claimed by the Roman aristocrat; cf. U. Knoche, *Philologus* Suppl. 27.3 (1935); R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 51, 70, 146, 151, 442. Since it is here ascribed to both Cato and Caesar, it cannot carry with it that connotation of a desire for *dominatio* described by Cicero, *Off.* 1.64; cf. Drexler, *NJW* 4 (1928) 395; Vretska, *Sallustius: Invektive und Episteln* (1961), on *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.5.5.

sed alia alii: *alius* is to be taken here as equivalent to *alter* (*Thes. LL.* 1.1648.70ff.), so that *alii* is dative and *alia* nom. sing. fem. agreeing with *gloria*; cf. Livy, 1.21.6, 1.25.5.

54.2-6. **Caesar beneficiis . . . illum adsequebatur:** the meaning that S. gives to many of the qualities he lists here can be inferred from his treatment of these same qualities elsewhere in the monograph. The tendentious element which undoubtedly lies behind these portraits, the factor of bribery for instance that marked Caesar's generosity, the nexus of family relationships on which Cato's influence largely rested, has influenced opinion concerning S.'s reason for including the *synkrisis* in his work (Appendix VII). Reference has been made earlier (p. 17) to the fact that his use of an antithetical structure enables S., by the explicit attribution of certain characteristics to a person, to hint at the lack of others. Thus the qualities of *pudor* and *abstinentia*, ascribed to Cato in sec. 6 and elsewhere contrasted with *audacia* and *largitio*, might suggest that the latter *malae artes* (3.3) are not wholly unknown to Caesar. The listing of qualities does give the impression that the intention is one of parallelism and contrast, but S. could hardly have written otherwise in a summarising treatment of the achievement and character of the two men. For our purpose it is sufficient to call attention to parallels which occur elsewhere in the work, and to the interpretation that may be elicited therefrom.

54.2. **munificentia:** apparently a Sallustian innovation, adopted by Livy (e.g. 22.32.9, 22.52.7, 32.40.9). Cf. *BJ* 110.5.

magnus . . . clarus: see on 53.1.

mansuetudine et misericordia: cf. 52.11, 27 for Cato's estimation of these qualities.

severitas: an abiding impression left by Cato on others; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 1.18.7, 2.1.8.

54.3. **dando** etc.: S. avoids *largiundo* here with the pejorative associations he had given this word elsewhere (e.g. 23.3, 38.1, 52.11, 12), yet by contrasting in Cato's case *nihil largiundo* he almost invites invidious comparison. On the other hand, to have used *nihil dando* would have left the undesirable impression that Cato was *tenax et avarus*.

nihil largiundo: Suetonius, *Jul.* 19 reports that Cato sanctioned bribery in order to secure the election of Bibulus, colleague of Caesar in the consulship of 59.

miseris perfugium: cf. Suetonius, *Jul.* 27 who reports that all kinds of people in difficulty flocked to the patronage of Caesar. Note also the highly rhetorical flavour of *miseris perfugium* . . . *malis pernicies*.

54.4. **postremo . . . enitescere posset:** with this final sentence on Caesar S. returns to the full concept of *virtus* as he had defined it in his introduction. Caesar desired the opportunity to display his *virtus* in an active fashion to achieve *egregia facinora* and thus to acquire *gloria*.

in animum induxerat: "had made up his mind from the outset". The only place where this expression occurs in S.; it is met with in this form in Plautus (e.g. *Rud.* 22) and Terence (e.g. *Hecyr.* 603) and later in Livy (e.g. 1.17.4, 2.15.3). Cicero, with the possible exception of *pro Sulla* 83, writes *animum inducere*.

neglegere . . . denegare: depending, like *laborare, vigilare,* on *in animum induxerat*; Kurfess' punctuation suggests that he views these as historic infinitives.

sua neglegere: cf. Suetonius, *Jul.* 72 for his readiness to suffer discomfort for the sake of a sick friend.

dono dignum: Sallustian brevity; *dono* = *quod daretur*. S.s' choice is dictated by the form of the sentence and by the alliteration.

imperium exercitum bellum novom: for asyndeton of three words see Introd. p. 14.

bellum novom: i.e. a war begun by himself and for which he had sole responsibility. It was not a question of such wars as had been waged by Sulla, Crassus and Pompeius, wars which had their seeds in the past and in which the victorious general reaped what his predecessors has sown. The wars in Gaul, Germany and Britain

were wars on new ground. This sense of *novom* occurs in Livy, 9.42.4, 31.8.6.

54.5-6. **at Catoni . . . adsequebatur:** this summary concerning Cato, which could be understood as implying that Cato's ambitions lay in civil life, is significantly lacking in that element of activity, producing *egregia facinora,* which S. had stressed elsewhere, e.g. 2.9.

54.6. **non divitiis . . . certabat:** there would seem to be a conscious recall here by S. of a saying attributed to the elder Cato, preserved by Plutarch, *Cato Mai.* 10.4, to the effect that he preferred to strive with the best men with regard to ἀρετή than with the rich in wealth and the avaricious in avarice.

cum strenuo virtute: *virtus* used in the more restricted sense of "uprightness". *Strenuus,* which denotes activity and courage, is part of the traditional aristocratic vocabulary, often joined with *fortis.* As with *integritate vitae* and in particular *neque factione cum factioso,* S. is overlooking the facts of Cato's career; he has moved some way towards the idealisation of Cato which was prevalent later, and blurred the historical truth which we can recover from sources such as Suetonius, Cassius Dio and Appian.

cum innocente abstinentia: for *innocens* here see on 12.1 n. *innocentia pro malevolentia.*

esse quam videri: recalls the famous line of Aeschylus, *Sept. contra Theb.* 592 (Dindorf): οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν ἄριστος, ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλειν; cf. Plutarch, *Aristides,* 3.4. But the idea is fairly common, cf. Martial, 8.38; Vell. Pat. 2.35.2.

illum adsequebatur: *adsequebatur* is the reading of nearly all codices. From 3.2, 12.1 (on which see note) I prefer the alternative reading *sequebatur* (adopted by Jordan and Wirz). *Adsequi* carries the idea of something deliberately sought; *sequi* of something that comes of its own accord. Cf. Pliny, Ep. 1.8.14 *sequi enim gloria non appeti debet.* Note also Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.9, 4.69.22M. If *sequebatur* is accepted, *illum* and not the variants *illam* or *illa* fits in best with the meaning.

55.1. **antecapere:** cf. *BJ* 21.3 and see on 13.3 n. *antecapere.*

tresviros: i.e. *capitales,* also called *triumviri capitales* (Livy, 32.26.17). Most codices simply show *IIIviros*; it is not unlikely that S. would have preferred the earlier form *tresviri.* He tends to avoid time-honoured terminology; later (55.5) he has *vindices rerum capitalium* instead of the technical *triumviri rerum capitalium.*

quae [ad] supplicium postulabat: the MSS have *ad* after *quae* and attempts have been made to emend, e.g. *quoad* (Weidner), *quae id* (Gertz). Ahlberg suggested *quae ad supplicium postulabantur*. It is simpler to omit *ad* and accept *postulabat* as belonging to the well-known type of expression *res postulat*—like *locus postulat* (Livy, 5.47.3) or *belli usus postulat* (id. 34.6.13).

55.3. **idem fit ceteris:** see on 52. 25 n. *deprensis hostibus*.

est in carcere locus: the ἔκφρασις τόπου with which Livy begins his report on the battle of the Trebia: *erat in medio rivus* (21.54.1) has been considered proof of the epic character of the description (Klotz, *RE* XIII.849). On the model of Homer, e.g. *Iliad* 2.811, *Odyssey* 3.293, similar expressions found their way into Roman epic; examples in F. Bömer, *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 131. See R. G. Austin (*Aen.* 2.21) on the epic mannerism in the following *in eum locum* (55.5).

quod Tullianum appellatur: after Ennius, e.g. *Ann.* 409, *Sc.* 345V, attraction of the relative where the predicative noun is a name is attested only in prose. See Kühner-Stegmann, 1.38f. The *carcer*, between the Temple of Concord and the Curia at the foot of the Capitol, consisted of several rooms, of which the Tullianum was the death-chamber. No satisfactory explanation of the name Tullianum has been offered. Neither the ancient references to Servius Tullius as its builder (Varro, *LL* 5.151; Festus, 490L) nor the etymology *tullius* = jet of water (Festus, 482L) fits in with the building materials used or the level of the Comitium as ascertained by excavation. Tenney Frank, *CJ* 19 (1925) gives a brief and clear exposition of the evidence. For descriptions see Jordan, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom* 1.1.505f., 1.2.323ff.; Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, s.v. *Carcer*; Huelsen-Carter, *The Roman Forum*.

ubi paululum ascenderis ad laevam: the entrance to the *carcer* in S.'s day led from the Comitium into a room that lay north of the Tullianum and from there one turned to the left and entered the chamber above the Tullianum by a few steps. This doorway has been closed by a thick medieval wall (Tenney Frank, *op. cit.*). *Descenderis* of one MS, adopted by Kritz and Dietsch, is probably due to the impression on the scribe of the well-known feature of the Tullianum as being a subterranean chamber.

circiter duodecim pedes humi depressus: the depth is now less than six feet, but the present floor is certainly not ancient and lies more than six feet above the third century level of the Comitium.

In point of fact, the chamber was not literally *humi depressus*, but by S.'s time the ground had been filled in around it, and since the only entrance was by means of a trap in its roof, it appeared to be wholly underground (Tenney Frank, *op. cit.*).

55.4. **sed incultu tenebris odore . . . facies est:** *sed* connects and continues the description. Heinze on Lucretius, 3.1014 notes that S.'s description forms a companion piece to Lucretius' description of Tartarus. *Incultu*, cf. *BJ* 2.4; Livy, 42.12.7 is a rare word (*Thes. LL.* 7.1071.25ff.). Most codices have *inculta*.

55.5. **vindices rerum capitalium:** Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 2.595f. takes these to be *tresviri* mentioned in 55.1; cf. 30.7 *minores magistratus*. Mommsen maintains that they carried out executions with their own hands when the prisoners were women or men of high position. From Val. Max. 5.4.7 it appears that they also used deputies.

laqueo gulam fregere: either by stopping the wind-pipe or by breaking the neck, cf. Horace, *Epod.* 3. This is the clearest expression of the form of death inflicted in the late Republic. Appian, *BC* 1.26 testifies to this form of execution in the case of some of the followers of the Gracchi. Other authorities for the latter such as Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.13; Vell. Pat. 2.7.2; Orosius, 5.12.9; Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 17.4 use a very general expression like Cicero's *in carcere necatum esse dixit.*

55.6. **ita ille patricius . . . exitum [vitae] invenit:** the extent to which these words indicate a judgement on S.'s part as to the moral and legal correctness of the punishment is a matter of dispute; cf. E. Skard, *SO* 9 (1930) 86; Büchner, 170; O. Seel, *Sallust* etc. 40 n. 1, 74 n. 3; Wirz, *ad loc.* It should, however, be noted that S. 's phrase *dignum moribus factisque* is very probably part of the traditional vocabulary for such a context; thus Plutarch, *Marius* 12.4, reporting on the execution of Jugurtha uses the expression εἶχεν ἀξία δίκη τῶν ἀσεβημάτων, a close parallel to S.'s phrase.

exitum [**vitae**]: *exitium vitae* is the reading of all MSS. *Exitum* is the version quoted by Vell. Pat. 2.112.7; Aug., *Ep.* 43.2; Sulp. Sev. 1.51.2; Treb., *Claud.* 5.3; *vitae* is added by Hegesippus (4.20.18), Dictys (6.15). *Exitus* and *exitium* can each stand by itself, though an explanatory genitive, sometimes pleonastic, is more common with *exitus* (*Thes. LL.* 5.1539.68ff.). Firstly, then, I believe that *vitae* of the MSS is an interpolation. While *exitum* and *exitium*

are so easily confused that MS authority for one or the other is virtually negligible, I believe that S. used the archaic word *exitium.* The statement of Festus (71L): *exitium antiqui ponebant pro exitum; nunc exitium pessimum exitum dicimus* may help to explain S. 's choice. It was a word which continued to be widely used *de certo quodam genere necis* (*Thes. LL.* 5.1528.40ff.). Thus Plautus, *Aul.* 275; Ennius, *Sc.* 272V; Pacuvius, *trag.* 288R; Cato, 18.5J; Sallust, *BJ* 70.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.1.1, 14.7.6.

Chs. 56-61. *The End of the Conspiracy*

The figure of Catiline dominates the structure of these chapters which describe the crushing of the armed rebellion. Catiline is given a full speech whereas that of his opponent is reported in summary. The monograph ends with a description of the dead Catiline, a representative of the Roman potential for greatness and an exemplar of the basic weaknesses which at the time of writing were destroying the Republican system.

56.1. **ex omni copia:** *copia* refers to an undefined number, not to formations; Catiline's troops were in the process of being organised into formations. Cf. 56.3, 61.5; Cicero, *pro Mur.* 78; Caesar, *BG* 1.48.5; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.52.2, 4.4.3.

duas legiones: a consul commanded two legions. Catiline, who had assumed the insignia of consular power either to impress the country folk with a show of authority or because of a derangement of mind (cf. 20.17, 36.1), now keeps up the appearances of consular power.

cohortis pro numero militum conplet: a legion contained different numbers of men at different periods and varied in complement between 3000 and 6000. In the time of Polybius it was 4200. See Polybius, 6.20.8; *RE* XII.1196ff.; H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions*, Cambridge, 1958. Each legion was divided into 10 cohorts, subdivided into 30 maniples and further into 60 centuries. Since Catiline started with 2000 men his cohorts initially contained only 100 men, one-sixth of the ideal complement.

56.2. **ut quisque voluntarius aut ex sociis:** *voluntarii* were presumably those who were *extra coniurationem* (39.5). With *sociis* supply *coniurationis* (cf. 16.4, 40.6). On *venerat* see on 18.6 *transtulerat.*

numero expleverat: i.e. at least as far as numbers were concerned; the contrast follows in the next section: *sed ex omni copia*

etc. According to Plutarch, *Cic.* 16.4; Appian, *BC* 2.7 he had 20,000 men.

56.3. **ut quemque casus armaverat:** for the personification cf. Livy, 9.35.4 *quibus eos . . . locus ipse armabat.*

sparos: "hunting spears". It is not clear what form of weapon this was. Servius (*ad Aen.* 11.682) calls it *telum rusticum in modum pedi recurvum.* Festus (443L) defines it *spara parvissimi generis iacula a spargendo dicta.*

56.4. **modo ad urbem, modo Galliam vorsus:** *vorsus* without a preposition is very unusual; it occurs at *BJ* 58.4, 69.1, *Hist.* 1.55.19M with *ad* or *in,* and the only undisputed passage where the preposition is omitted is *BJ* 19.3, but that passage deals with direction towards and not motion towards. In our passage, where some MSS have *ad* or *in,* the preposition may have become a victim of the uncertainty of the scribes.

Since Antonius was approaching from the south, Catiline moved out of *Manliana castra* near Faesulae, but kept moving round the general area of Faesulae. A force under Marcius Rex had also been stationed near Faesulae (30.3).

sperabat . . . patravissent: from 44.6 and 48.4 it appears that the conspirators in the city were to time their moves to coincide with the arrival of Catiline in close proximity to Rome. The plan may have been changed because of the prosecution of the arrested conspirators because both here and in 58.4 it seems that Catiline expected them to strike immediately and send him further supplies. S., apparently, has neglected to record detail of a change of plan.

56.5. **interea servitia repudiabat . . . communicavisse:** from 44.6 it appears that Catiline was opposed to the use of slaves. He was undoubtedly aware of the usefulness to Cicero's conter-propaganda (cf. *in Cat.* 1.27, 2.19, 4.4, 13) of the fears which could be aroused by a hint of a slave revolt in an age when the memories of the Spartacus rising were yet alive and many could still recall the chaos resulting from the release of slaves in the time of Marius. Cassius Dio (37.33.2) states that Catiline in the end had no choice but to agree to the use of slaves, and S.'s use of *interea* here may be a hint at this final development.

servitia . . . quoius: S. elsewhere uses a plural pronoun or verb referring to a singular collective noun (Introd. p. 16). The use of a singular pronoun referring to a plural collective noun is not paralleled

elsewhere; it is probable that some such word as *generis* has dropped out of the text.

alienum suis rationibus: see on *aliena consilia,* 40.5.

57.1. **reliquos:** around 3000, according to Cassius Dio, 37.40.1. Read *relicuos,* cf. 52.4.

per montis asperos magnis itineribus: it is probable that Catiline could not use the easy route across the plains from Faesulae to Pistoria because Antonius was near Faesulae with his army (56.4).

Pistoriensem: called after Pistoria, a town in Etruria, about 20 miles N.W. of Florence. Now Pistoia.

in Galliam Transalpinam: Catiline's final objective. He evidently intended heading for the Allobroges. In spite of betrayal by their legates he could still expect a welcome from a people whose discontent had not been satisfied; cf. 40.1, 45.1 n. *Pomptino.*

57.2. **in agro Piceno:** more accurately, *in agro Gallico Picenoque* (Cicero, *in Cat.* 2.26) and so in a position to anticipate Catiline's movements. Cassius Dio, 37.39.2 wrongly has Metellus near Faesulae. For the probable movement and counter-movement and the time involved see G. V. Sumner, *CPh* 58 (1963) 215ff.

praesidebat: i.e. *in praesidio erat*; a military term used absolutely here. It is often used with the dative, cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 5.37; Livy, 22.11.9; Curtius, 4.5.9.

57.4. **expeditus in fuga sequeretur:** Priscian's *expeditus* (3. 343.20K) has misled several editors. Dietsch's expedit<us impedit>os was his attempt to account for *expeditos* which is the reading of all MSS. Other modern editors besides Kurfess, e.g. Wirz and Ernout, have retained Priscian's *expeditus,* presumably on the grounds that *utpote qui* must, as if it were *quippe qui,* introduce a reason why Antonius was not far behind. The MS reading should be retained; one cannot have *in fuga sequeretur* without a reference to the person who is *in fuga.* The right text could be: *neque [tamen] Antonius procul aberat utpote qui magno exercitu, locis <tamen> aequioribus expeditos in fuga sequeretur.* For a similar possible displacement see on *aetate,* 14.5.

57.5. **montibus atque copiis . . . neque . . . ullam spem:** Catiline explains this in 58.4-5. The forces of Antonius were pressing at his rear, Metellus stood ready at the foot of the Apennines (57.3) to intercept him if he moved towards Gaul.

statuit cum Antonio . . . confligere: Catiline decided that

the best of his slim chances lay in a battle with Antonius, who might not fight too hard; cf. 21.3, 26.1; Cassius Dio, 37.39.3. See further on 59.4.

Ch. 58. *The Second Speech of Catiline*

A pre-battle oration such as this was a firm *topos* in historiography, and as such contains a series of conventional concepts and phrasing. At the same time it contains features which are purely Sallustian. Artistically, it enables Sallust to vary his narrative method; in the course of the speech the reader is informed quite vividly of the physical and psychological factors which play a decisive role in the final action. See introductory note to ch. 20.

58.1-2. **Conpertum ego... auribus officit:** a commonplace, repeated in summary form in *BJ* 85.50. Cf. Thucydides, 4.95.1, 5.69.2; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 3.3.50-51; Livy, 2.46.6f., 26.3.4. Catiline presents himself as a seasoned general, and thus starts off with a lie.

58.1. **neque ex ignavo... neque... ex timido... fieri:** the first *neque* is not connective; the clause as a whole is explanatory without the introdictory particle, cf. 2.3, 11.3, Introd. p. 15. Note the *inconcinnitas* of the sentence, the manner in which the rhyming possibilities of *ignavo-timido, strenuum-fortem* are avoided. See on 5.4 n. *satis eloquentiae.*

58.2. **patere:** used in a different sense below, 58.9. Here it means "to be displayed". See on 10.1 n. *patebant.*

timor animi: for similar pleonasm cf. 53.1 *virtutem animi,* which should be compared with 1.5 *vine corporis, an virtute animi.* In the present case, as with *corporis* in 1.5, the presence of *auribus* may have influenced the introduction of *animi.* But see, however, 51.4, 61.4, *BJ* 4.4, 20.1, 57.6.

58.3. **quo... uti:** the same variation as in 33.1.

58.4. **scitis equidem... nequiverim:** Catiline's dwelling on factors of failure and disappointment at this juncture heightens the element of desperation which marks the speech throughout. He can be using this element only to elicit that feeling of desperate courage which alone can promise victory. The detail of the recrimination against Lentulus is consistent with the common opinion held of him, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 3.16; Cassius Dio, 37.32.3; probably partisan, it conflicts with the picture of Lentulus' activity in chs. 43-44.

scitis equidem: see on *equidem ego*, 51.15.

socordia atque ignavia: a combination also used in 52.29, *BJ* 31.2.

quoque modo . . . nequiverim: equivalent to *et quo modo* (*dum . . . opperior*) *factum sit ut in Galliam proficisci non possem.*

dum . . . opperior: retention of indicative with *dum* in *oratio obliqua* is rare in classical Latin, where it is mainly met with in poetry. For examples cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.101; Ovid, *Met.* 4.776. It is more frequent in Tacitus, e.g. *Ann.* 15.59.1.

58.5-7. **nunc vero quo loco . . . iter aperiundum est:** for a general similarity of situation and feeling cf. Xenophon, *Anab.* 6.3.16-17.

58.5. **quo loco:** "how badly it stands with us"; *loco* used figuratively, the preposition being omitted when an adjective is used, cf. Livy, 3.68.3 *peiore est loco.*

iuxta mecum: cf. 2.8; probably colloquial, it is found elsewhere only in Plautus.

58.6. **si maxume animus ferat:** *si* with potential subjunctive has a concessive force, "even with the best will". The following clause, which expresses the impossibility as a fact, remains in the indicative.

egestas: used, as in *BJ* 44.4, with objective genitives.

58.7. **ferro iter aperiundum est:** has many parallels in Livy, e.g. 4.28.4 (Ogilvie's note).

58.8. **vos divitias decus . . . portare:** recalls the words of Catiline's first speech, 20.14. The order of preference and expectation, with *divitiae* as the leading concept, is the same. Conventional in character, this type of appeal also appears in Livy, e.g. 27.45.7.

58.9. **si vincimus:** present preceding future, common in early Latin; see Bennett, 1.65f. for examples. Below we have *cesserimus* according to strict rule as antecedent to *fient.* Cf. *BJ* 31.19, *Hist.* 2.98. 10M.

commeatus abunde: *commeatus*, plural nominative as in *BJ* 28.7; *abunde* may go with *patebunt*, but on the adjectival use of adverbs see Introd. p. 20 and 21.1 n. *quibus mala abunde.*

municipia atque coloniae: see on 17.4.

58.10. **neque locus . . . texerint:** a conventional maxim partly repeated in *BJ* 97.5; Livy, 3.60.8.

58.11. **praeterea milites . . . pro potentia paucorum:** for the general idea cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.* 3.3.44; Thucydides, 2.89.4.

necessitudo: Catiline turns proverbial material to his purpose; cf. Simonides, fr. 542 Page; Sophocles, fr. 235N; Plato, *Laws* 741a; Ogilvie on Livy, 4.28.5.

nos pro patria . . . pro potentia paucorum: cf. 20.7-8 where the same contrast was used for electoral propaganda. There is some consistency in the fact that the contrast, a readily available and much used rallying cry (e.g. *BJ* 31.2; Livy, 2.28.7), remains as one of the motivating factors, according to Catiline, of the conspiracy.

58.12. **memores pristinae virtutis:** mention of former *virtus* as a motivating force is also a *topos* of this type of address. S. uses it again at 60.3, *BJ* 49.2, 97.5; it occurs often in Livy.

58.13. **in exilio aetatem agere:** it is probable that Catiline thought of this alternative in his own case also. Cf. 20.9 and see notes on 32.1-2, 34.2.

58.14. **quia illa . . . haec:** even though an adversative particle is omitted (cf. 35.2, 52.6) the contrast with the action mentioned before is very clear. *Haec* refers to the content of sec. 11 and forms the appropriate contrast to the present *illa.*

58.15. **si haec:** *haec* picks up preceding *haec* and gives greater stress to the physical circumstances of their situation as a whole. The repetition also retains an air of rhetorical artifice, an impression confirmed by the use of the maxim *nemo nisi . . . mutavit.*

mutavit: the gnomic perfect of a general proposition; cf. *concupivit,* 11.3.

58.16-17. **nam in fuga . . . pro muro habetur:** aphorisms appropriate to the context, but also reflecting the rhetorical flavour referred to.

58.16. **in fuga salutem sperare . . . dementia est:** cf. *BJ* 74.1; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 3.3.45; Livy, 10.28.12.

ea vero: see Introd. p. 15 and 8.1 n. *ea.*

58.17. **semper in proelio . . . qui maxume timent:** cf. *BJ.* 107.1.

audacia pro muro habetur: expressed as *fortissimum quemque tutissimum* in *BJ* 87.2, a phrasing which occurs in Livy, 25.38.18 and in the words of the elder Cato in Livy, 34.14.4; cf. also Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 47.

58.18-19. **Quom vos considero . . . fortis facit:** repetition

of the type of exhortation that marked his first speech, cf. 20.9ff. To the conventional elements of *virtus, aetas* etc. is now added the decisive factor of *necessitudo.*

58.19. **animus aetas virtus:** note the asyndeton, Introd. p. 14.

58.20 **nam multitudo . . . loci:** the reader is provided with the practical and military particulars of the situation.

queat: this verb occurs only here in *Bell. Cat.*; about six times in *Bell. Jug.*

58.21. **quod si virtuti . . . hostibus relinquatis:** the speech ends with a traditional store of expressions. Thus for *cavete inulti* etc. cf. Livy, 4.39.4, 25.16.19; for *sicuti pecora trucidari* cf. Livy, 5.44.7, 28.16.6, 38.17.6. The phrase *cruentam atque luctuosam* is paralleled in Livy, 7.8.7, 25.16.19.

59.1. **signa canere iubet:** *signa* is subject to *canere,* as in *BJ* 94.5. In *BJ* 99.1 he uses a personal and a neuter subject with *canere.* The expression used here is also found in Livy, e.g. 1.1.7, 24.15.1 and in Caesar, e.g. *BC* 3.92.5.

exaequato periculo: S.'s description of Catiline's tactic here has been taken as an imitation of Caesar, *BG* 1.25.1 (Klotz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, Leipzig, 1930, 122). But both the expression and the concept are apparently part of a traditional *topos*; cf. Livy, 3.62.8.

animus amplior: cf. 40.6.

59.2. **uti . . . erat:** takes up *pro loco. Uti* is equivalent to *quod* (Kroll) as in Plautus, e.g. *Men.* 63, *Mer.* 371, *Most.* 268 and Terence, *Andr.* 738, *Adelph.* 350.

ab dextra rupe aspera: *aspera* is accus. pl. neut. agreeing with *loca* understood. *Ab dextra rupe,* corresponding to *sinistros montes,* depends on *aspera,* and is to be explained as an extension of the formula *a dextera,* as in Plautus, *Asin.* 260, *Amph.* 244. Wirz expands: *ab dextera (erant) loca propter rupem aspera.*

59.3. **ab his omnis evocatos et centuriones . . . subducit:** all MSS have the reading *ab iis centuriones omnis lectos et evocatos.* Most editors have accepted the punctuation of Kvičala (*Zeitschr. f. Österr. Gymn.* 1863, 624f.): *centuriones, omnis lectos et evocatos,* meaning *qui omnes lecti et evocati erant,* i.e. specially selected men who had already served out their time and were seasoned veterans. An alternative punctuation, *centuriones, omnes lectos, et evocatos,* (Dietsch, 1864, Jacobs-Wirz, 1894) assumes that S. is talking about three types of soldier who formed the front line. However, the

version of Servius (*ad Aen.* 2.157), adopted above by Kurfess, has much to recommend it; the presence of *gregarii* in the text almost demands that *evocatos* should be technical. It is not unlikely that the scribe, not understanding the technical terminology, played about with the text and *lectos* appears as a result.

[**armatum**]: as it appears in the transmission, *armatum* is plainly absurd and cannot be retained. It most clearly implies that other troops were not armed at all; from 56.3 we know that all had weapons of some kind. It also implies, even more ridiculously, that to arm a front-line soldier is unusual and remarkable. Either, then, *armatum* must be excised or the text corrected in some other way. In view of 56.3 it would be very much to the point for Catiline to put the best armed of the *gregarii* at the front. The problem is to find a satisfactory way of recovering this sense; *optume quemque armatum* would be a questionable expression and *optumo quemque armatu* is not easy to justify.

Faesulanum quendam: perhaps Furius, cf. 50.4.

curare: in a rare military meaning of "to command"; cf. *BJ* 60.1, 60.5.

cum libertis et colonis: the MSS vary between *colonis, coloniis, colonibus*. Dietsch conjectured *calonibus*, "soldiers' servants"; cf. *Hist.* 1.77.7M), a reading adopted by Jordan and by Jacobs (6th. ed.). The reading *colonis* has been defended by G. Perl, *Hermes* 97 (1969) 501f., but from the palaeographical and military point of view *calonibus* seems to be the more likely reading. By perseveration the *-is* ending intruded after *libertis*, and the process of corruption could well be something like *calonibus-calonis-colonis*. From a military point of view the most seasoned and well-armed troops were more likely to come from the ranks of the Sullan colonists; to conceal the nature of his forces Catiline had to pack his front line with the pick of his troops and to be content to form a *cohors praetoria* from his freedmen and camp-followers.

libertis: if S. is using this word accurately (cf. 50.1) Catiline's own freedmen are meant.

propter: the only use by S. of *propter* in a local sense.

aquilam: the standard of the legion since the army reforms of Marius (Pliny, *NH* 10.16). The *aquila* mentioned here may have been a personal trophy of Catiline, dating from his service under Sulla, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.24.

bello Cimbrico: in 102 B.C. the Cimbri from N. Germany and

the Teutones invaded the Roman provinces. Marius defeated the Teutones at Aquae Sextiae in Gaul, C. Lutatius Catulus the Cimbri at Vercellae.

59.4. **pedibus aeger** etc.: Cassius Dio (37.39.4) informs us that Antonius feigned illness in order to avoid the reproaches of Catiline should they meet. Mommsen believed it was S.'s intention to whitewash the Triumvir's uncle, but the content of 21.3, 26.1, 4. hardly fits in with such an objective. In any case, Antonius was a singularly unsuccessful general; cf. Cassius Dio, 38.10.2-3, and note the taunt of M. Caelius Rufus as reported by Quintilian, 4.2.123 = *ORF*², fr. 17, p. 483Mal.

M. Petreio: later took part as Pompeius' lieutenant in the war against Caesar in Spain and Africa (Caesar, *BC* 1.38ff.). His somewhat bizarre death is described by Appian, *BC* 2.100; cf. *Bell. Afr.* 94; Livy, *Epit.* 114; Florus, 2.13.69. After the defeat at Thapsus, Juba, king of Numidia, despairing of his life, shared a last meal with Petreius after which they fought a duel so as to give the impression that both had met a gallant death. Petreius was killed in the duel, but Juba had to persuade a slave to run him through with a sword. See *RE* XIX.1182(3).

59.5. **ille . . . certare:** even this summarised report of Petreius' speech reveals that its content was traditional material for such an occasion; the same clichés appear as in both of Catiline's speeches; cf. 21.4; Thucydides, 7.69.2.

tumulti: a war in Italy or against the Gauls which entailed a swift levying of troops was called *tumultus*; cf. *Hist.* 3.48.10M; Cicero, *Phil.* 8.2. On the form *tumulti* cf. Nonius 786L and see on *senatus*, 30.3.

appellat hortatur rogat: asyndeton. (Introd. p. 14).

pro aris atque focis: see on 52.3.

59.6. **homo militaris:** cf. 45.2. Cicero, *pro Sest.* 12 speaks of Petreius' *mirificus usus in re militari*.

praefectus: denotes here a commander of allied contingents. Such officers, mainly Romans appointed by consul or Senate, were equal in rank to *tribuni militum* of the Roman forces. But *praefectus* was, apparently, a mark of higher distinction; cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 7.5.3; Suetonius, *Aug.* 38.2.

facta . . . fortia: an archaic alliterative doublet (*Thes. LL.* 6.1155.76).

animos adcendebat: the phrasing and content of this exhortat-

ion are traditional. Cf. *BJ* 49.4 and especially Livy's treatment of Hannibal, e.g. 21.43.17, 30.32.6. The *topos* goes back to Homer, cf. *Iliad* 10.68. See F. Erbig, *Topoi in den Schlachtenberichten römischer Dichter*, Diss. Würzburg, 1931, 12.

Ch. 60.

This brief description of battle contains expressions traditional for such a topic and at the same time illustrates a narrative style peculiar to Sallust. The point of view of the reporter is not restricted, as in Caesar (e.g. *BG* 4.32.34), to one of the protagonists but alternates between the opposing factions. Sallust is interested in showing how the emotions and actions of the two sides affect each other, and this constantly changing point of view is most clearly indicated by the frequent change of subject throughout. See K. Latte, *NWzA* 2R.H4, Leipzig, (1935) 21ff.

60.2. **a ferentariis:** a rare word for "light-armed troops". Varro, *LL* 7.57, talks of the term as applied to *equites ferentarii* who carried *arma quae ferrentur ut iaculum*. Vegetius (*Re Mil.* 1.20) ranks them with the slingers and puts them on the wings. It is probable that S. borrowed the word from Cato, cf. 81.10J.

cum infestis signis: Kroll's (297) explanation that *cum* represents an archaic reinforcing of the instrumental ablative would fit in with S.'s well-attested predilection for archaisms. Examples of a similar construction in *Thes. LL.* 4.1369, 40ff. include Plautus, *Rud.* 1363; Cato, *RR* 77; Lucilius, 1241; Accius, *trag.* 445; Catullus, 98.3; Cicero, *Fam.* 8.1.1.

gladiis res geritur: a traditional phrase, cf. Caesar, *BG* 1.52.4, 7.88.3, Livy, 9.41.18, 28.2.6.

60.4. **interea Catilina . . . simul exequebatur:** on the succession of historic infinitives to supply animation and the use of the concluding imperfect see Introd. p. 20. Here *exequebatur* has a summing up function.

cum expeditis: could refer to *levis armaturae milites*, but is more probably used of those who *ad pugnandum alacres videbantur*.

omnia providere: the mark of a good general, a military cliché; cf. *BJ* 100.3; Livy, 3.63.3.

strenui militis . . . boni imperatoris: cf. 20.16. Another *topos*; cf. Caesar, *BG* 5.33.2; Livy, 9.1.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 10.4; Curtius, 3.11.7; Pliny, *NH* 7.140.

60.5. **cohortem praetoriam:** cf. *BJ* 98.1; an elite formation first constituted by Scipio Africanus, according to Festus (249L). From Livy, 2.20.5 it appears that such a *corps d'élite* was in existence before this time but Livy may be guilty of anachronism here, cf. 29.1.1. Such a force was the forerunner of the praetorian cohort of the Empire, but it differed essentially from the latter in function and importance.

in medios hostis: i.e. *in mediam hostium aciem.*

alios alibi resistentis: "offering resistance here and there"; Petreius goes on to clean up pockets of resistance.

60.6. **in primis:** seems by position to go with *pugnantes* "among the foremost", a traditional phrase which goes back to Homer, e.g. *Iliad* 19.151.

60.7. **Catilina . . . pugnans confoditur:** to assume that Catiline is here portrayed as a tragic hero (e.g. Vretska, *Hermes* 72 (1937) 218f., cf. H. Gugel, *Festschr. Vretska*, Heidelberg, 1970, 361ff.) is to demand far too pregnant a meaning from language which was almost sterotyped for a description such as this. For the traditional elements cf. especially Livy's treatment of the death of Hasdrubal; Virgil, *Aen.* 9.400; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.57.

confoditur: a word avoided by Cicero, but well attested in military historians, e.g. Livy, 3.70.7 (Ogilvie's note); Nepos, *Pel.* 5.4; Frontinus, *Strat.* 2.5.33.

61.1. **Sed confecto proelio . . . in exercitu Catilinae:** for a general similarity of description cf. Xenophon, *Ages.* 2.14.

tum vero: see 2.2 n. *tum demum.*

cerneres: past potential; cf. 25.3: *discerneres.*

61.2. **nam fere . . . corpore tegebat:** cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 240-1 *animam amittunt prius quam loco demigrent; quisque ut steterat iacet optinetque ordinem.*

[**vivos**]: this word forms a typical Sallustian contrast with *amissa anima* and should be retained.

pugnando: a modal use of the gerund, developed out of the instrumental. See on 7.7.

61.3 **<alis alibi stantes>:** this phrase which has not survived in our MSS of S. fits in with the meaning and with Sallustian style —it forms a suitable contrast to *conciderant.* The obsolete form *alis* for *alius* does occur in inscriptions e.g. *CIL* 2.2633 and in writers with an archaising tendency; thus Lucretius, 1.263, 3.970, 5.1456; Catullus, 66.28. See Neue-Wagener, 2.531f.

advorsis vulneribus: i.e. *advorso corpore volneribus acceptis.* Cf. *BJ* 85.29; Livy, *Epit.* 13; Appian, *Hann.* 50.

61.4. **longe a suis . . . repertus est:** a similar description is used of Decius Mus in the battle of Sentinum, 295 B.C. by Livy, 10.29.19 and of the first Decius Mus in the war against the Latins, 8.10.10.

paululum etiam . . . retinens: the expression *ferocia animi* occurs in Livy (e.g. 23.10.6). There is a general similarity, too, in the description by Vell. Pat. 2.27.3 concerning Telesinus, the Samnite leader at the Colline Gate: *Telesinus postera die semianimis repertus est victoris magis quam morientis vultum praeferens.* This could point to a use of traditional phraseology from older historiography. Cf. Silius Italicus, 5.673, 13.733.

etiam: "still"; unlike 14.5 *etiam* here performs a function and is accepted without dispute by editors.

61.5. **postremo:** see on 14.6.

61.6 **ita cuncti . . . pepercerant:** it is not possible to arrive at an accurate figure concerning the casualties in the battle of Pistoria. Cassius Dio (37.40.1) gives the number as 3000; Diodorus (apud Photium 638) as 6000. For vaguer comment cf. Plutarch, *Cic.* 22.5; Eutropius, 6.15; Florus, 2.12.12. I have assumed that Appian's 20,000 (*BC* 2.7) really refers to Catiline's forces before the desertions referred to in 57.1. See on 56.2.

iuxta: see on 37.8.

61.7. **neque tamen . . . adeptus erat:** another traditional type of expression with many parallels in Livy, e.g. 7.8.7, 10.36.15. S. appears to be the first writer to use *incruentus*, cf. *Thes. LL.* 7.1059.33ff. He is also probably responsible for the introduction into the language of other composites of a similar type (Introd. p. 19).

nam strenuissumus . . . discesserat: cf. Livy, 8.29.13, 9.32.8.

61.8. **multi autem . . . cognoscerent:** the emphasis on *amici*, conveyed by the triple *amicum, hospitem, cognatum* and by the use of the typically Sallustian *alii . . . pars*, and the closing reference to *inimici* should be viewed as a deliberate stressing of the perversity of civil strife. Cf. Lucan, 4.562f.

61.9. **ita varie . . . agitabantur:** the atmosphere of this conclusion has been adduced by some commentators as proof of a pervading pessimism in S.'s historical viewpoint. But such a manner of concluding a description of war, especially a war of this type,

is by no means confined to S. The alliterative *luctus—laetitia* occurs in Livy, e.g. 8.33.22, 26.37.2. A similar atmosphere pervades Livy's description of the rescue of the body of Aulius in 9.22.10.

The monograph ends abruptly. It might not be over-fanciful to suggest that the inconclusiveness of S.'s description is meant to underline the inconclusiveness of fratricidal strife, the shadow of which lay over Rome at the time of writing. In addition, S. has used the Catilinarian conspiracy to illustrate a basic moral theme; his interest in the subject as history is secondary. To learn of subsequent events the reader must resort to Cassius Dio, 37.40-41.

APPENDIX I

THE INTRODUCTION TO *BELLUM CATILINAE*

The untidiness of presentation which characterises the opening chapters of this monograph and which is exemplified especially at 4.5 *pauca prius explananda sunt, quam inittum narrandi faciam,* and at 5.9 *res ipsa hortari videtur . . . disserere,* has given rise to great difference of opinion between scholars attempting to explain either the nature and relevance of the introductory chapters or the structure of the work as a whole.

Studies dealing with the structure (Introd. p. 11) and in particular with the prologue of this work start from the premise that Sallust, like his predecessors, conformed more or less strictly to the convention of placing an exordium to his work, an exordium which contained traditional *topoi—de persona, de historia, de materia*—cf. C. Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores,* Lipsiae, 1863, 538. Within such a conventional structure the portion commonly labelled 'prologue' can be taken to end at 4.5. What is overlooked, however, is the possibility that Sallust, besides experimenting with style and form, also experimented with structure. Such innovation may conflict with tidiness of presentation, but I believe it to have been undertaken with the intention of ensuring that the principles of the moral outlook within which he framed his treatment of the events of the conspiracy and by which he judged the incident as a whole should be clear and unambiguous to the reader.

Commentators who see in the prologue only an apologia for historiography ignore the full implication of the analysis of concepts in chs. 1-2, and, more important, the treatment of these same concepts in chs. 6-13 and later on in the narrative. This seems to me to be a major defect in such treatments as A. D. Leeman's "Sallusts Prologe und seine Auffassung von der Historiographie 1. Das Catilina Proömium", *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954) 323ff. Such an interpretation is more obviously applicable to the far more compact prologue of *Bellum Jugurthinum*; there Sallust is less concerned with moral and ethical definitions and is content to define the political ideas which form the framework of his second monograph in an excursus (ch. 41ff.) more neatly connected with the relevant events of his narrative.

There is little virtue in indulging in fruitless argument about the terminological niceties of 'prologue' and 'narrative'. The structure outlined in this Commentary is based on two assumptions. The first is an acceptance of the view of such scholars as F. Egermann ("Die Proömien zu den Werken des Sallust", *SAWW*, 214, 3 (1932), K. Vretska, ("Geschichtsbild und Weltanschauung bei Sallust", *Gymnasium* 48 (1937) 24-43), and D. C. Earl (*The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge, 1961) that the leading thoughts of the prologue have an organic connection with the work, and that without them one cannot understand the whole work. The second assumption is that Sallust views his historical material primarily from an ethical and moral viewpoint, a factor which has also influenced the selection, the omission and the arrangement of incidents (Appendix III).

As far as *Bellum Catilinae* is concerned this means that the necessity to expound and to clarify his leading ideas results in the postponement of the narrative proper to the beginning of ch. 14. It means also that in the midst of the narrative there occurs copious and necessary cross-referencing to the main concepts on which the point of view of the writer is based. Thus by means of the speeches of Caesar and Cato, of the *synkrisis* of ch. 54, and of his own personal comments in 36.4-39.5 and ch. 53, Sallust separately and specifically underlines what his narrative was also intended to convey—*sceleris atque periculi novitas*.

APPENDIX II

SOURCES OF THE CONCEPTS IN THE INTRODUCTION

The problem of the sources of the ideas expressed in the introduction has occupied the endeavours of a host of scholars, even of those who can see in the prologue little relevance to the rest of the work. In some cases the search for sources is restricted to the content of chs. 6-13 in an attempt to clarify Sallust's view of history.

Posidonius is a leading candidate as a model for Sallust. The chief champion of the Posidonius-theory is W. Schur (*Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934), but he had his predecessors and has had his disciples: C. Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1895, 657-62; E. Schwartz, "Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung", *Hermes* 32 (1897) 554-608; Kremsier, 1906; W. Gerhäuser, *Der Protreptikos des Poseidonios*, Diss. Heidelberg, 1912; J. Morr, *Die Entstehung der Einleitungen von Sallusts bellum Catilinae und Jugurthinum*, Troppau, 1914; W. A. Baehrens, "Sallust als Historiker, Politiker und Tendenzschriftsteller" *NWzA* I. R.H.4 (Leipzig 1927², 1929²) 35-82; W. Kroll, "Sallusts Staatsschriften" *Hermes* 62 (1927) 372-92; L. Wohleb, "Zur abfassungszeit den Monographien Sallusts", *PhW* 48 (1928) 1242-7; K. Bauhofer, *Die Komposition der Historien Sallusts*, Diss. München, 1935; H. Oppermann, "Das heutige Sallustbild", *NJ* 11 (1935) 47-53.

Some scholars weaken a valid case by going too far in their insistence on Posidonius as a source. Thus C. Wagner, *De Sallustii prooemiorum frontibus* Diss. Leipzig, 1910, puts forward the bizarre thesis that Sallust broke the *Proptrepticus* of Posidonius into two parts and distributed them over the prologues of his two monographs; traces of Isocrates, also discernible in the prologues, are held to have come to Sallust through Posidonius. Wagner is followed in his main view, but more soberly, by W. Theissen, *De Sallustii Livii Taciti digressionibus*, Diss. Berlin, 1912, and by W. W. Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa*, Berlin, 1914, 130-1. An interesting example of how cautious scholarship can proceed the other way is provided by E. Norden. He proposed Posidonius,

but only as a possibility, in his *Römische Lit.*, repeated in *Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig 1916², 37 n. 1 and in *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*, Leipzig-Berlin, 1920, 145 n. 2. In 1927 however, he disavowed this view in the third edition of *Röm. Lit.* (*Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* 1³, 4, 36f.).

The difficulty of attaining an unassailable position is also demonstrated in the case of W. Schur who, while taking Posidonius as the main source, is forced, where Posidonius proves inadequate to his thesis, to introduce as supplementary sources the work of Polybius and Panaetius. This line of 'double-security' is also followed by K. Mack, who, as the title of his thesis (cited above) shows, took Thucydides to be a major source. His adoption of Thucydides had been anticipated by S. Dolega, *De Sallustio imitatore Thucydidis* etc., Diss. Breslau, 1871; E. Mollmann, *Quatenus Sallustius e scriptorum Graecorum exemplo pendeat*, Königsberg, 1878; R. Schild, *Quibus in rebus Sallustius Thucydidem respexerit aut respexisse credatur*, Nordhausen, 1888.

The chief rival to Posidonius as a major source is Plato. The case for Plato has been argued most extensively by F. Egermann, "Die Proöemien zu den Werken des Sallust", *SAWW* 214, 3 (1932). He, it is true, makes it clear that it is no longer a question of seeking out one Greek source from which every concept in Sallust's introduction and excursus issues in its complete form. He looks rather for an intellectual area where Sallust might have found similar ideas expressed and which he might if necessary re-shape to his own purposes. Egermann is thus forced to have recourse to Cicero's *De republica* and to Dicaearchus to account for the strongly Roman content and atmosphere of the Sallustian arguments. While Egermann has received some support from A. D. Leeman, other scholars have posited an intermediate Stoic source for the Platonic thoughts, e.g. Pantzerhielm-Thomas, "The Prologues of Sallust", *SO* 15-16 (1936) 140-162 and E. Bolaffi, "I proemi delle monografie di Sallustio", *Athenaeum* 16 (1938) 128-157, who favours the combined influence of several sources, mainly Plato and Stoic writers.

Other candidates for the role of major source who have had less influence on subsequent scholarship are Cato-Sisenna, proposed by G. Brunnert, *De Sallustio imitatore Catonis Sisennae aliorumque veterum historicum Romanorum*, Diss. Jena, 1873. H. Jordan suggested Ateius Philologus in his *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte*

der lat. Sprache, Berlin, 1879, 353; Fannius was proposed by A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur röm. Geschichte*, Berlin, 1921, 175; Ephorus by R. Laqueur, "Ephorus 2", *Hermes* 46 (1911) 347-50; Rutilius by M. Gelzer, "Nasicas Widerspruch gegen die Zerstörung Karthagos", *Ph* 86 (1931) 261ff., on the grounds that Rutilius conveyed to Posidonius not only his historical raw material but his view of Roman history.

The variety of the sources proposed, the inability to adhere exclusively to one major source invite caution. As is illustrated in the Commentary, there are echoes of a number of authors belonging to widely different periods—Demosthenes, Isocrates, Xenophon, Polybius—in addition to those cited above. There is little doubt that a basic concept of the prologue, the view that man is a double entity of body and soul, is derived from Plato's doctrine of dualism, or that Sallust's choice of 146 B.C. as the crucial year of Roman history is a legacy of Posidonius. But whether, in spite of even close verbal echoes in some instances, he actually used either of these writers as a primary source is another matter.

Büchner (116, 327) sounds a sensible note of warning. All the concepts which Sallust borrows as the framework for the exposition of his basic theme were widely known and widely expressed. This, significantly, is repeatedly pointed out by those scholars who have dealt at length with Sallust's predecessors, e.g. W. Avenarius, "Die griechischen Vorbilder des Sallust", *SO* 33 (1957) 48-86; P. Perrochat, *Les modèles grecs de Salluste*, Paris, 1949, 85; E. Skard, "Sallust und seine Vorgänger etc.", *SO* Fasc. Suppl. 15 (1956); H. Patzer, "Sallust und Thukydides", *NJ* 116 (1941) 124-36. While such concepts serve their purpose in giving wider scope to the specific ideas of Sallust, heighten their trustworthiness, lend emphasis, they need indicate nothing more than the benefits of a general education and the wide reading of a man who prides himself on his literary pursuits (*BC* 53.2, cf. 4.2). With this in mind, one should also not overlook the influence of earlier Roman historiography on our author. It is going too far to maintain that Sallust adhered to one philosophical system. In this respect it is true to say that "for the most part the ideas there set out had long been the common property of the philosopher and the rhetorician" (Laistner, *Greater Roman Historians*, 52).

APPENDIX III

THE ACCURACY OF SALLUST'S NARRATIVE

The definitive study of the errors or inadequacies of Sallust's version of the conspiracy is that of C. John, *Jahrbücher für cl. Phil.* Suppl. VIII (1876) 703ff.; a clear and convenient summary is that of O. Seel, *Sallust von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur Coniuratio Catilinae*, Leipzig (1930) 49ff.

Besides contradictory statements in the context of the conspiracy of 66 B.C. which are dealt with in the notes to ch. 18, Seel lists the following main inaccuracies in Sallust's treatment of the conspiracy of 63 B.C.

(a) The report of the first assembly of the Catilinarians (ch. 17 and 20-22) is pure invention, and as a result the whole conspiracy is antedated.

(b) Curius is referred to accurately as an informer in 63 (26.3, 28.2). S., however, uses this feature also for 64 (ch. 23), an inaccuracy and an obvious duplication. The same applies to the story of Fulvia in ch. 23. This is free invention—Fulvia, with Curius, first appeared on the scene in 63.

(c) S. has very definitely misdated the assembly in the house of Laeca (27.3-4).

(d) In 24.2 it is reported that Manlius was in Faesulae to prepare for civil war. In ch. 27 it is stated that Manlius was sent to Faesulae, giving the impression that up to that time he had been in Rome.

(e) Catiline's outburst (31.9): *quoniam quidem circumventus ab inimicis praeceps agor, incendium meum ruina extinguam*, belongs to another time and another place.

In the light of other abundant evidence available for the conspiracy it is incontestable that S. is guilty of inaccuracy. The main effort of scholars has been therefore to explain why S. deliberately distorted the chronology of events. There are two main schools of thought. The first, represented by E. Schwartz (*Hermes* 32 (1897) 554ff.), regards these inaccuracies as part of a general partisan aim, viz. to discredit Cicero and to defend and rehabilitate the memory of Julius Caesar. This partisan-theory for long won

wide assent among scholars and it has noticeably influenced the conclusions of E. G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context*, Oxford, 1924 = *JRS* 7 (1917) 153-228.

To the second school of thought belong scholars who seek to justify S.'s handling of his material on artistic grounds. A variety of reasons is proposed and most of these go back to S.'s method of composition—his habit of compression and simplification, his re-creation of his material in order to deliver a historical judgement on the events. Büchner's (290ff.) handling of this aspect may be taken as representative of the general line of thought.

Seel (*op. cit.*) maintains that S.'s mistakes are due not to deceit but to ignorance, which is accounted for by lack of material; he accepts the thesis of H. Peter, *Literatur*, 2.192 and of Schwartz, *op. cit.* that S. did not use Cicero as his source but a summary of material provided by L. Ateius (Suetonius, *de Gram.* 10; *HRR* 1.111).

Syme (69ff.) makes the point that the more abundant the sources of information the greater are the chances of error; the majority of the mistakes in Sallust are due therefore to inadvertence or lapse of memory. He selects only two points on which the reputation of Sallust as a historian can seriously be attacked—his antedating of the start of the conspiracy and the order and inter-relation of events in October-November 63. See also W. Wimmel, *Hermes* 95 (1967) 192ff.; H. Drexler, *SO* 45 (1970) 49-59.

Sallust's mistakes are not errors of fact; it is chiefly a matter of chronological displacement. His concentration on the moral aspect precludes a more traditional historical narrative. The effect of this viewpoint on selection of material and presentation of fact has been dealt with in the notes to chs. 6-13, and his adherence to a method which selects, omits, re-shapes and re-emphasises should not cause undue perturbation in the reader. His handling of the conspiracy is to be regarded as the presentation of a simple moral principle: Rome's greatness was founded on the moral standards of the *maiores*; contemporary decline is due to moral degeneration. This is illustrated from and justified by the history of this attempt to overthrow the Roman constitution. If in the process he introduces material not available elsewhere, if by his selection of material he produces a significant shift of emphasis, his contribution to our understanding of these final decades of the Roman Republic is of permanent value.

APPENDIX IV

THE CONSPIRACY OF 66 B.C.

The consular elections of 66 B.C. resulted in the designation of Autronius Paetus and P. Cornelius Sulla. These *designati* were successfully prosecuted on a charge of *ambitus* and were unseated. Fresh elections were held and L. Aurelius Cotta and L. Manlius Torquatus were appointed in their place. This undoubted historical event forms the main background to a period of unrest exacerbated by rumours to which the label, *The First Catilinarian Conspiracy*, has been attached.

The question of the authenticity of this conspiracy became one of the most debated points of modern historical research, an investigation which has led to conflicting results and at times to conjectures of a bizarre kind. The reasons for this are to be found in the nature of the primary sources and in the manner in which this evidence has been interpreted by modern historians.

The primary evidence, as conveniently summarised by R. Seager, *Historia* 13 (1964) 342, is as follows:

(1) Cicero, *in Tog. Cand.* (Asconius 92C), *pro Mur.* 81: a conspiracy of Catiline and Piso to massacre the Optimates, dated to 65 by Asconius.

(2) Torquatus in Cicero, *pro Sulla* 10ff.: a conspiracy of Autronius, Sulla and Catiline to make the two first named consuls, conceived in 66 to materialise on Jan. 1, 65 or shortly before.

(3) Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.15: some nefarious activity on the part of Catiline on Dec. 29, 66 B.C.

(4) Cicero, *pro Sulla* 51: a conspiracy of Autronius and Catiline to make themselves consuls.

(5) Suetonius, *Jul.* 9: a conspiracy of Autronius and Sulla to restore themselves to office.

(6) Sallust, *BC* 18: a conspiracy of Autronius, Catiline and Piso to make Autronius and Catiline consuls, planned in Dec. 66 for execution on Jan. 1, 65.

(7) Sallust, *BC* 18: a conspiracy of the same to murder *plerosque senatores* on Feb. 5, 65.

(8) Cassius Dio, 36.44.3f.: a conspiracy of Autronius, Sulla Catiline and Piso to make Autronius and Sulla consuls.

The variation in the alleged persons associated with this plot has been noted by M. I. Henderson, *JRS* 40 (1950) 13f., who concludes from the obvious discrepancies that the story did not form part of any 'authorised version' of history and was simply revived from time to time to be used for immediate purposes of propaganda or scandal. In this connection the different times and purposes of the Ciceronian speeches should be taken into account. See in particular the description of Cicero's handling of his case in *pro Sulla* by Seager (*op. cit.* 340) and Syme (89f.). Asconius reveals that the story of the plot depended from the start on *opinio*; moreover at the time of our earliest evidence for the plot Piso was already dead and thus open to any slander. More important, the date in the various versions shifts between 66 and 65; this uncertainty as to date may account for S.'s statement concerning the postponement of the assassination attempt.

If this material with its many obvious discrepancies was all that was available, the story of *The First Catilinarian Conspiracy* would never have found its way into the thoughts and statements of modern historians.

However, S.'s statement (19.1) that behind Piso stood the formidable figure of M. Licinius Crassus gave a wider and deeper significance to this episode. Asconius (83C) is more explicit: *eius quoque coniurationis quae Cotta et Torquato consulibus ante annum quam haec dicentur facta est a Catilina et Pisone, arguit M. Crassum auctorem fuisse*; cf. Cassius Dio, 39.10.20. Suetonius (*Jul.* 9) implicates not only Crassus but Caesar; his sources for the statement are Tanusius Geminius, an annalist hostile to Caesar (F. Münzer, *RE*IVA. 2231ff.), M. Actorius Naso, of whom nothing else is known, the edicts of Bibulus and the orations of Scribonius Curio, avowed anti-Caesarians (on Bibulus cf. Caesar, *BC* 3.8.3, 3.16.3; on Curio cf. Cicero, *Brut.* 218f.) and a personal interpretation (*significare videtur*) of a lost letter of Cicero to Axius. All in all, not the most compelling of 'authorities'.

The Suetonius passage, however, despite its palpable inconsistency with other sources, became of overwhelming importance for modern historical research since the first half of the 19th century. This alleged conspiracy, however inadequately documented, could be

given credence if viewed as part of Crassus' well-attested designs in the period 66-62, and Caesar's involvement fitted in well with the 19th century view of the demonic-revolutionary element of Caesar's personality, represented especially by Mommsen.

Though Drumann (vol. 3, 143-4, Königsberg, 1837) rejected Suetonius' account as a fabrication as far as Crassus and Caesar were concerned, in the edition by P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, Berlin, 1899, 2.438 n.6 the editor on his own account accepts the implication of Crassus and Caesar. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* 3^9, 176-7, C. John, *N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* Suppl. 8, 1876 accept Suetonius' version. Cf. also A. Wirz, *Catilina's und Cicero's Bewerbung um das Consulat*, Zurich, 1864; E. Baur, *Zur Chronologie der Catil. Verschwörung*, Strasburg, 1875; E. von Stern, *Catiline u.d. Parteikämpfe in Rom*, Dorpat, 1883; E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 554ff.

The effect of E. Meyer's work, *Caesar's Monarchie und d. Prinzipat d. Pompeius*, Stuttgart, 1918 was to incline most scholars to the opinion that Crassus and Caesar were the real authors of the conspiracy; the fact that the earliest sources contain practically nothing about this was due only to Cicero's fear of the two men and Sallust's conscious effort to protect Caesar. Thus A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur röm. Geschichte*, Berlin, 1921; M. Gelzer, *Caesar der Politiker und Staatsmann*, 2nd ed. 1941, 49, *RE* IIA2.1693ff. s.v. *Catilina*, take the same view as Meyer. In his 6th ed., 34, Gelzer exculpates Caesar but still accepts a conspiracy of Sulla, Autronius and Catiline.

Other scholars are more cautious. T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic* etc., Oxford, 1923, 1.234f., cf. 449, includes Catiline and acknowledges a connection between Crassus and Caesar and Piso's mission to Spain. A similar caution marks M. Cary's treatment in *Cambridge Ancient History* IX.479, where some participation by Crassus is acknowledged but not complicity in murderous designs. Such caution, however, does not mark the contribution of J. Carcopino who (*Histoire romaine*, Paris, 1936, 2.610ff.) re-hashes the whole story as told by Suetonius with a multitude of detail and a highly imaginary characterisation of personalities.

The tendency to accept this conspiracy as historical still persists. Thus A. La Penna, *Stud. it. fil. class.* 31 (1959) 35, assumes participation by Caesar on the grounds that P. Sulla was later a partisan of Caesar. See also C. E. Stevens, *Latomus* 22 (1963) 397-435. Others, however, are no less convinced that we are here dealing

with a myth. Besides M. I. Henderson and R. Seager, H. Frisch, *Class. et Med.* 9 (1947), E. S. Gruen, *CPh* 64 (1969) 20ff. are in no doubt as to the falsity of this conspiracy. R. Syme, noting with approval the reserve of J. L. Strachan-Davidson ('the evidence is so inconclusive, and the story, as told, contains so many contradictions and improbabilities, that I prefer to pass it over as wholly or almost wholly apocryphal'—*Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic*, New York - London, 1894, 91), puts the case more bluntly: "The whole edifice is ramshackle. It ought to have been demolished long ago" (101).

APPENDIX V

THE PORTRAIT OF SEMPRONIA (CH. 25)

As far as the content of this portrait is concerned, the view of E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 570, preceded by E. von Stern, *Catilina und die Parteikämpfe in Rom*, Dorpat, 1883, 124, is that the portrait is a polemic on the part of the Caesarian Sallust against the mother of D. Junius Brutus Albinus, one of Caesar's murderers. Such a partisan objective has been accepted in varying degree by W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, 172; I. Calevo, *Il problema della tendenziosita di Sallustio*, Udine, 1940, 51f. L. Alheit, *NJbb.* 43 (1919) 38f., sees in the brilliant formulation of this picture a barbed insult against Sulla. G. Boissier, *La Conjuration de Catilina*, Paris ², 1925, 129ff., views it as a denunciation by Sallust, the moralist and admirer of old-fashioned Roman *virtus*, of the prototype of the emancipation movement among the aristocratic women of Rome. F. Münzer, *RE* IIA.1446(103) and *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, Stuttgart, 1920, 272f., accounts for the selection of Sempronia for special treatment on the grounds that she was, presumably, the daughter of C. Gracchus. K. Büchner, *Sallust*, Heidelberg, 1960, 134f., assumes that Sallust could not resist the fascinating psychological puzzle represented by such a woman as Sempronia.

A reaction against the thesis of such partisan or personal motives is represented by the works of O. Seel, *Sallust* etc., Leipzig, 1930, 73f.; K. Vretska, *Gymnasium* 1937, 35; W. Steidle, *Historia*, Einzelschr. 3 (1958) 5; W. Fauth, *Der. Altspr. Unterricht* 5 (1962) 34ff.

Structurally, the passage has been viewed as a sort of padding by which Sallust filled up a gap in events up to Catiline's activity after his second electoral defeat, a gap caused by his antedating of the start of the conspiracy in ch. 17ff. A particular objection is that 26.1, with *his rebus conparatis*, refers back to ch. 24 as if ch. 25 were not present at all. Büchner (*op. cit.* 134) maintains that *sed* which introduces the portrait carries the same note of digression as *sed antea* which introduces the report of the First Conspiracy in ch. 18. However Fauth (*op. cit.* n. 37) points out that *sed* of

ch. 25 could have the same selective force as that which introduces ch. 23. W. Schur (*op. cit.* 175) notes that the background material to the conspiracy, which began with the portrait of Catiline (chs. 5 and 15) as the representative of the male participants (14-16) is here concluded with the portrait of Sempronia as the typical representative of his female support (ch. 24.3-4).

To mention typical examples of the females who played a role in the emergence of Catiline, *mulieres quae primo . . . aes alienum conflaverant* (24.3), was a perfectly proper thing for Sallust to do. But to give a full-scale sketch, comparable with that of Catiline, to a woman who plays no recorded part in the story earlier or later was not proper historical practice. We have here a grave structual fault, indeed far the worst fault in a generally rather clumsy work.

APPENDIX VI

THE EXECUTION OF THE ARRESTED CONSPIRATORS

The execution of Lentulus and his associates quickly became the subject of dispute. Cicero was the target of attack by political opponents from the days following the execution until his banishment by vote of the people in 58. This condemnation was reversed and the exile was restored eighteen months later. The question of the legality of Cicero's procedure, however, continues to be the subject of debate among scholars. The basic question is whether Cicero's action was that of a courageous and public-spirited magistrate using his legitimate powers with vigour or whether it was an act of panic by a timid and self-seeking partisan. The legal aspects of the affair are discussed by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* 3.1240ff.; J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic*, London, 1894, 151ff., *Problems of Roman Criminal Law*, Oxford, 1912, 1.240ff.; T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, Oxford, 1923, 1.278ff.; A. H. J. Greenidge, *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, Oxford, 1901, 397ff. The best short treatment of the problem is that of H. M. Last, *JRS* 33 (1943) 93ff. cf. *CAH* IX. 82ff. On the history of the *s.c.u.* and the problems it gave rise to see G. Plaumann, *Klio* 13 (1913) 321ff.; B. Rödl, *Das Senatus Consultum Ultimum*, Bonn, 1969; A. W. Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, Oxford, 1972, 149-174. On Cicero and the *s.c.u.* see T. N. Mitchell, *Historia* 20 (1971) 47ff.

To deal with emergencies for which ordinary legal methods were inadequate Roman practice had evolved first the office of dictator (Cicero, *Leg.* 3.3.9; Imp. Claudius, *Orat.* 1.28), later substituted for by *senatus consultum ultimum*. In both cases the onus of decision rested on the consul or presiding magistrate who in the case of the dictatorship was responsible for the appointment of the Dictator, and in the case of the ultimate decree had to decide when and how to use the extraordinary powers vested in him. *Senatus consultum ultimum* was, in effect, a notice to the magistrates of the Senate's opinion that a situation was about to arise in which the interests of the state would require them to ignore some of the normal limitations on the exercise of their *imperium* and to act in accordance

with the dictum enunciated in Cicero's words *salus populi suprema lex esto* (Leg. 3.8). It was the responsibility of the magistrate to decide that such a situation had arisen, and his decision might subsequently be challenged. The magistrate's right to decide in the affirmative in appropriate circumstances, and, having so decided, to use measures of repression which were extra-legal had been established by the case of L. Opimius (Cicero, *in Cat.* 1.4, *Phil.* 8.4, 14; Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 14, 18). The precedent created by Opimius' acquittal on a charge of unlawful execution (Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.106, 132, *Brut.* 128; Livy, *Epit.* 61) also stood.

Viewed in the light of this practice and such a precedent, Cicero's justification can only have been that he had had the conspirators put to death in a manner of which the illegality was beyond dispute but at a time of crisis so severe that the legal procedure of accusation and trial could not be followed without serious risk to the safety of the state. This seems to have been the conclusion of Mommsen who changed his first opinion "brutal murder" (*Röm. Gesch.* 3.189ff.) to a view that *s.c.u.* did really and legally justify the consul in treating all the conspirators as enemies of the state; Mommsen retains for censure Cicero's action of consulting the Senate instead of putting the prisoners to death of his own responsibility (*Staatsrecht* 3.1246).

The situation has indeed been obscured by Cicero's handling of the initial stages of the affair. There is no doubt that he alone was and remained solely responsible for the decisions taken. A magistrate might in such circumstances arrive at a decision with the help of advice from any assessors he might select to act with him. Cicero, who had advice of his brother and P. Nigidius Figulus (Plutarch, *Cic.* 20), nevertheless took the unprecedented action of seeking the advice of the Senate. This step has been interpreted as an attempt to foist off on to the Senate a responsibility which was Cicero's alone. This view gains support from the ambiguity of Cicero's statement when he referred the matter: *sed ego institui referre ad vos, patres conscripti, tamquam integrum, et de facto quid iudicetis et de poena quid censeatis*, and especially of his concluding words: *quacumque ratione placet celeriter vobis vindicandum est.* Cf. Cassius Dio, 37.35.4.

Despite Cicero's statement in 45 B.C.: *me autem hic laudat . . . non . . . quod denique ante quam consulerem ipse iudicaverim* (*Att.* 12.21.1), the situation for him contained elements of

uncertainty, and these may have been the reason for his referral to the Senate; (i) it could be argued that a situation fairly under control did not warrant the exercise of powers granted by *s.c.u.*; (ii) no case absolutely parallel had occurred since the introduction of *lex Sempronia*, which granted right of appeal to condemned citizens; all previous cases of declaration as public enemies had involved persons still at large and either in arms (e.g. M. Fulvius Flaccus, cf. Cicero, *in Cat.* 4.13; Appian, *BC* 1.119) or supposed to be in arms (e.g. C. Gracchus, cf. Vell. Pat. 2.7.2; Orosius, 5.12.9; Plutarch. *C. Gracch.* 17.4); (iii) Cicero may have felt that there was doubt that the formal declaration of Catiline and Manlius as public enemies (36.2) really included their associates in the city (but cp. *de Amic.* 37); indeed one of the chief items on the agenda of Dec. 4 was the formal declaration of the arrested men as *hostes* (50.3); (iv) Cicero knew that the results of the exercise of the extra-legal powers conferred by *s.c.u.* had been challenged by the representatives of the people from the first; the basic problem was the vagueness of the exhortation which the decree contained and the interpretation to which it was susceptible, *popularis* reaction being mainly concerned with the overruling of laws *de provocatione*. Cicero, therefore, anticipated being called upon to account for his action and naturally looked for support from the Senate. It was important for the sake of the impression to be produced that the execution should appear, not as an act of violence or panic on the part of the magistrate, but as the deliberate judgement of the supreme council of the state, which had seen the proofs of guilt and heard the confessions of the accused. By confirming the action of the consul, the Senate, although it could not relieve him of his sole responsibility, could yet give him sufficient support to justify his action.

It should be noted that in the two speeches with which Sallust sums up the debate of Dec. 5 there is no discussion of the relationship between existing laws and the extra-legal powers conferred on a magistrate by *s.c.u.* Caesar's argument is not based on any questioning of the legality of the decision to be taken; his appeal is directed to the kind of decision which should be reached. Indeed, he appears to concede that by the Senate's decree the death penalty is legal (51.36). In effect he does not contest the appropriateness of the decree in the circumstances, as he did in 49 (Cicero, *Phil.* 8.11ff.); his sole argument was that only measures sufficient for the safety

of the state should be embarked upon. Cato differs from Caesar only on the last point; his final proposal states in their starkest form the elements which justify the conferment on the consul of the right to proceed to the supreme penalty in the exercise of the powers ceded to him under the *s.c.u.*—the supreme danger to the state, the proof of crime, *mos maiorum.* (52.36).

Cicero's justification of his action has been further obscured by his defence. If a magistrate is to plead that the act with which he is charged, though admittedly contrary to statute law, should nevertheless not be condemned as illegal since it had been done at a time when the law was impotent and his supreme duty to assure the safety of the state compelled him to take measures which were extra-legal, he must be able to count on a court which will recognise and weigh the evidence he adduces to support his reasons for taking extraordinary measures. Cicero could not count on a favourable hearing in 58 B.C., and it is therefore not surprising that he sought other lines of defence. As already pointed out, Cicero's employment of the Senate as his advisory body could not be regarded as easing the magistrate of his burden; at best it only strengthened his hand for the task which he must accomplish alone. Yet Cicero (*in Pis.* 14) tried in vain to argue that the examination of the conspirators and witnesses before the Senate constituted a Senatorial *iudicium*; that the sentence was the result of a *quaestio* established by the Senate (*pro Domo* 33, cf. *Phil.* 2.18), that the task of judgement and execution should be regarded as carried out at bidding of the Senate. This body did not issue, nor did it have the power to issue an order of this kind. Cicero erred by proving too much. Treatments of this problem which accept Cicero's line of defence and assume that this question of the conspirators was to be conducted on ordinary legal methods of procedure are thus begging the question from the outset; cf. R. W. Husband, *CJ* 9 (1914) 4ff. Similarly the contention that the Senate bore the final responsibility under the *s.c.u.* (cf. T. N. Mitchell, *op. cit.*) does not account for the fact that in 121 and 58 it was the consul who came under attack. Cicero's adversaries at the time recognised both his responsibility and the basic correctness of his action; they even went so far as to assert that Cicero had forged the *s.c.u.* (*pro Domo* 50).

Cicero's defence suffered from a lack of clear precedent for the use of extraordinary powers assumed by the *s.c.u.*, and an

inbuilt Roman reluctance to inflict the death penalty on citizens, especially citizens of prominence. This reluctance is expressed legally by laws *de provocatione* (see nn. 51.22) and in practice by the opportunity normally given to the condemned to satisfy justice by suicide or self-banishment. On the death penalty as an element of Roman legal procedure see Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 911ff.; for a discussion of Roman practice see F. Münzer, *Hermes* 47 (1912) 161ff.

The consul's action throughout seems to have been both correct and prudent. He had the right to expect Senatorial support (Syme, 110). His expectation was destroyed by the envy of the Optimates, by the political upheaval which followed his consulship, and by his own vanity (cf. *in Cat.* 3.2). This vanity led to a self-praise *non sine causa sed sine fine* (Seneca, *de Brev.* 5.1) and eventually alienated even those who accepted that his handling of the Catilinarian conspiracy was justified by the declaration of a state of emergency, and that he had indeed rendered a great service to the state.

APPENDIX VII

CAESAR AND CATO IN SALLUST

The comparison between Caesar and Cato is a topic dealt with in most general works on Sallust; e.g. H. Drexler, "Sallust", *NJ* 4 (1928) 390ff.; E. Skard, "Sallust als Politiker", *SO* 9 (1930) 69ff.; O. Seel, *Sallust von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur Coniuratio Catilinae*, Leipzig, 1930, 43ff.; W. Schur, *Sallust als Historiker*, Stuttgart, 1934, 191ff.; *idem*, "Nachträgliches zu Sallust", *Klio* 11 (1936) 60ff.; G. Carlsson, *Eine Denkschrift an Cäsar über den Staat*, Lund, 1936, 83ff.; K. Vretska, "Der Aufbau des Bellum Catilinae", *Hermes* 72 (1937) 124ff.; V. Pöschl, *Grundwerte römischer Staatsgesinnung in den Geschichtswerken des Sallust*, Berlin, 1940, *passim;* D. C. Earl, *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge, 1961, 99ff.; R. Syme, *Sallust*, Berkeley-Cambridge, 1964, 103ff. Specific studies have also been devoted to it, e.g. F. Lämmli, "Sallusts Stellung zu Cato, Caesar, Cicero", *Mus. Helv.* 3 (1946) 94ff.; A. La Penna, "L'interpretazione Sallustiana della congiura di Catilina", *SIFC* 31 (1959) 1ff., 127ff.; L. Schmüdderich, "Das Bild Caesars in Sallusts Verschwörung des Catilina", *Der Altspr. Unterricht* 5.5 (1962) 42ff.; H. Drexler, "Sallustiana", *SO* 45 (1970) 59ff.; B. Shimron, "Caesar's Place in Sallust's Political Theory", *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 335ff.

The basic aim of these and other treatments of this topic has been to designate and to substantiate to what extent Sallust's own verdict is discernible in his final treatment of these two outstanding personalities of the period. Such a purpose has led, inevitably, to a conflict of views and to a manipulation of evidence which sometimes borders on the desperate. The most common method is to assume that the speeches of chs. 51-52 are inextricably linked with the comparison and to argue either that the *synkrisis* was a natural and inevitable outcome of the speeches (e.g. Vretska) or that the speeches were composed with the *synkrisis* in mind from the outset (e.g. Schur). On this basis it is assumed, for instance, that since Cato's speech contains more numerous and more obvious echoes of Sallustian concepts and phrasing it is a re-expression of basic Sallustian views; hence in the comparison, especially if one remembers the warning concerning the perversion of vocabu-

lary uttered by Cato (52.11), it is Cato who bears the imprint of Sallust's final approval. Thus, for this or for other reasons, Drexler (who considerably modifies his view in *SO* 45, 1970), Skard, Egermann, Lämmli, Earl, Syme.

The opposite point of view does not lack support. Not surprisingly, E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 572, adhering to the basic thesis of his work, asserts that Caesar is the hero of Sallust's comparison. One indication of the desperate measures to which even learned men can be reduced in defence of a fiercely held thesis is the compromise suggested by R. Wirtz, *Beiträge zur catilinarischen Verschwörung*, Diss. Bonn, 1910, 40, that Sallust, disguising his political convictions, exalted Cato for the greater glory of Caesar. Skard's view concerning the importance of the echo of Sallustian concepts in Cato's speech is strongly resisted by Seel, and the latter's view that Caesar is depicted as a great statesman while Cato by contrast is a mere doctrinaire is supported by Schur and E. Löfstedt (*Roman Literary Portraits*, Oxford, 1958, 98).

In view of Sallust's own political career and his relationship with Caesar, his presentation of Cato has not failed to arouse surprise, e.g. H. M. Last, "Sallust and Caesar in the 'Bellum Catilinae", *Mélanges Marouzeau* (1948) 365. Some react more strongly: La Penna holds that only philological subtleties pursued by modern historians have produced the opinion that Sallust criticises Caesar by implication or allusion in the *synkrisis*; his view is rejected by Shimron who believes that by echoes of thought and phrase used in the portrait of Catiline Caesar is placed in the same class as Sulla and Catiline.

This feature may be explained and some non-contentious conclusions may be drawn concerning Sallust's own viewpoint if we remember some of the background which lies behind the portraits and the setting in which the comparison is placed, a setting which Sallust takes pains to elaborate in ch. 53.

The content of the comparison makes it immediately obvious that the men are not portrayed exactly as they would have been seen in 63 B.C. It is anachronistic and coloured by intervening events—the deaths of both men, the influence exercised by both, the growth of the Cato legend after the uncompromising decision to suicide at Utica, the many biographies and laudations subsequently published, e.g. that of Brutus (Cicero, *Att.* 12.21.1), the fierce *Anticato* of Caesar. Above all, Sallust's personal attitude

to Caesar must have been influenced by the turn of events between 63 and 42 B.C.

Perhaps the key to the puzzle of the *synkrisis* [1] lies in the setting in which it is deliberately placed by Sallust. In ch. 53 we are told quite clearly (i) that Roman greatness has always been based on the *virtus* of its outstanding citizens: *constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse* (53.4f.); (ii) that the effect of *luxuria* and *desidia* has been to destroy *virtus* so that *haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit* (53.5); (iii) that only two men have been *ingenti virtute divorsis moribus* (53.6).

It is within the framework of *virtus*, then, that Sallust compares the two men. In addition, what he has said in his introduction concerning *virtus* has to be borne in mind, particularly the tendency of *virtus* to degenerate into *ambitio* which *dolis atque fallaciis contendit* (11.2) and which strives for purely personal ends (38.3); likewise his insistence from the beginning that *virtus* should be active, that the man of true Roman *virtus* should *aliquo negotio intentus praeclari facinoris aut artis bonae famam quaerere* (2.9). On such premises, some conclusion as to Sallust's judgement on Cato and Caesar may be reached. It is the conclusion, expressed as a secondary possibility by Seel and Syme among others, that while both men possess *virtus* they are divergent in conduct, principles and allegiance. Their qualities are complementary no less than antithetic. Together they represent that total *virtus* which could have saved the Republic. But the *virtus* which they individually embody is flawed in the case of Caesar by the emphasis on *res privatae*, in the case of Cato by remoteness from participation in the *res publica*. From *virtus* so fragmented the restoration of *libera res publica* is not to be expected.

---

[1] "This is indeed so surprising that the *Bellum Catilinae* must remain something of a mystery until it is explained." Last, *op. cit.* 365.

INDEX NOMINUM

(References are to chapter and section of lemmata)

Aborigines, 6.1
Aefulanus (ager), 43.1
M'. Aemilius Lepidus, 18.2
L. Aemilius Paulus, 31.4
Allobroges, 40.1, 45.1
Q. Annius (Chilo ?), 17.3
C. Antonius, 21.3, 24.1, 26.1, 57.5
Apulia, 30.2, 42.1
Arretinus (ager), 36.1
Athenienses, 51.28
Aurelia Orestilla, 15.2
L. Aurelius Cotta, 18.5
P. Autronius Paetus, 17.3, 18.2

Bestia v. Calpurnius
Bruttius (ager), 42.1
Brutus v. Iunius

Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, 30.5
Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus, 30.3
M. Caeparius, 46.3
Caesar v. Iulius
L. Calpurnius Bestia, 17.3, 43.1
C. Calpurnius Piso 49.1
Cn. Calpurnius Piso 18.4, 18.5, 19.1
Camers, 27.1
Capito v. Gabinius
Capitolum, 47.2
Capua, 30.1
Carthago, 10.1 bis
L. Cassius Longinus, 17.3, 44.1
Catilina v. Sergius
Cato v. Porcius
Catulus v. Lutatius
Celer v. Caecilius
Cethegus v. Cornelius
Cicero v. Tullius
Cimbricum (bellum) 59.3
Cinna v. Cornelius
Ti. Claudius Nero, 50.4 bis
Concordiae (aedes) 46.5
C. Cornelius Cethegus, 17.3
L. Cornelius Cinna, 47.2
P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, 47.4
P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, 17.3, 46.5
L. Cornelius Sulla, 5.6, 11.4
P. Cornelius Sulla, 18.2
P. Cornelius Sulla Ser. f., 17.3
Ser. Cornelius Sulla Ser. f., 17.3
C. Cornelius (eques), 17.4, 28.1
Q. Cornificius, 47.4
Crassus v. Licinius
Creticus v. Caecilius
Crotoniensis, 44.3
Q. Curius, 17.3

Damasippus v. Iunius

Q. Fabius Sanga, 41.4
Faesulae, 24.2, 27.1
Faesulanus, 59.3
Figulus v. Marcius
Flaccus v. Valerius
C. Flaminius, 36.1
Fulvia, 23.3, 23.4
M. Fulvius Nobilior, 17.4
Fulvius (Senatoris filius), 39.5
P. Furius, 50.4

P. Gabinius Capito, 17.4, 40.6, 52.34
Galli, 52.24, 53.3
Gallia, 42.3, 56.4, 57.1
Gallica (gens), 40.1
Graecia, 51.39

Hispaniae (duae), 18.5
Hispania (citerior), 21.3
Hispani, 19.5

Italia, 16.5
C. Iulius 27.1
C. Iulius Caesar, 47.4, 49.4
L. Iulius Caesar, 17.1
L. Iunius Brutus Damasippus, 51.32
D. Iunius Silanus, 50.4, 51.16

Lacedaemonii, 51.28
Laeca v. Porcius
Lentulus v. Cornelius
Lepidus v. Aemilius
M. Licinius Crassus, 19.1, 47.4, 48.7, 48.9
C. Licinius Murena, 42.3

Longinus v. Cassius
Q. Lutatius Catulus 34.3, 49.1

Macedonicum (bellum), 51.5
A(?) Manlius Torquatus, 52.30
C. Manlius, 24.2, 27.1, 28.4
L. Manlius Torquatus, 18.5
C. Marcius Figulus, 17.1
Q. Marcius Rex, 30.3
Massilia, 34.2
Mauretania, 21.3
Metellus v. Caecilius
Mithridaticum (bellum), 39.1
Mulvius (pons), 45.1
Murena v. Licinius

Nero v. Claudius
Nobilior v. Fulvius
Nucerinus, 21.3

Orestilla v. Aurelia

Paulus v. Aemilius
Perses, 51.5
M. Petreius, 59.4
Picenus (ager), 42.1, 57.2
Piso v. Calpurnius
Pistoriensis (ager), 57.1
Plautia (lex), 31.4 bis
Cn. Pompeius Magnus, 17.7, 19.2, 19.5
Q. Pompeius Rufus, 30.5
C. Pomptinus, 45.1
Porcia (lex), 51.22
M. Porcius Cato, 52.1, 54.5
M. Porcius Laeca, 17.3, 27.3 bis
Punica (bella) 51.6

Rex v. Marcius
Rhodii, 51.5
Roma, 6.1, 27.2, 31.7, 40.5
Romani, 6.5, 53.3 bis
Romanus (adj.), 4.2, 29.3, 31.7, 49.4

L. Saenius, 30.1
Samnites, 51.38
Sanga v. Fabius
Sempronia, 25.1
Septimius 27.1
L. Sergius Catilina, 4.3, 5.1, 14.3, 16.4, 18.1, 18.3, 18.8, 21.2, 23.4, 26.1, 26.5, 43.2, 52.35, 60.4, 61.1
Sibyllini (libri), 47.2
Silanus v. Iunius
P. Sittius, 21.3
Spinther v. Cornelius
L. Statilius, 17.4, 52.34
Sulla v. Cornelius
Sullana (victoria), 21.4
Sullanae (coloniae), 28.4
Sullani (milites), 16.4
Sura v. Cornelius

L. Tarquinius, 48.3
Cn. Terentius, 47.4
Terracinensis, 46.3
Torquatus v. Manlius
Transalpine v. Gallia
Tullianum, 55.3
M. Tullius Cicero, 22.3, 23.5, 26.1, 29.1, 31.6, 43.1, 48.7, 48.8
Tullius v. Volcacius
Tusci, 51.38

P. Umbrenus, 40.1 bis

L. Valerius Flaccus, 45.1
L. Vargunteius, 17.3, 28.1
Vesta, 15.1
L. Volcacius Tullus, 18.2
T. Volturcius, 44.3, 46.6

INDEX RERUM

(References are to pages)

ablative
  absolute, 202, 231, 252
  difficulty of distinguishing from dative, 95, 265
abstract for concrete, 31, 106, 137f., 162, 230
adjectives
  used adverbially, 168, 266
  given passive meaning, 209
adverbs
  as substitute for pronoun + prep. 61
  as adjectival predicate, 148, 281
  coupled with noun used adverbially, 241
adverbial genitive 97f.
ambitio, 55, 91, 93
anachronisms, 116, 155f., 158, 174, 240f., 260, 296ff.
anaphora, 165, 229, 268
antithesis, 14, 17, 38, 51, 67, 139, 145, 224, 271f.
archaisms, 17ff., 32, 55, 76, 79, 85, 93, 94, 95, 97, 113, 116, 136, 138, 223, 269, 277, 286
artes (*bonae - malae*), 38, 43, 45, 49, 51, 86, 93, 104
asyndeton, 14, 51, 90, 93, 94, 97, 106, 114, 139, 146, 149, 216, 273, 283
attitude to Caesar 230, 233f., 240f., 262, 271, 272
  to Cato 257, 260, 271, 272
  to Cicero 154f., 160, 174, 185, 218
avaritia, 91, 94f.

boni, 39, 76, 133, 151, 193, 203
brevity, 14, 16, 38, 48, 56, 105, 184, 236, 273

candidature of Catiline, 124ff., 147, 150f., 161, 165ff.
chiasmus, 62, 93, 116, 144, 146, 157, 170
commonplace material, 30
concinnitas, 61, 112, 212
concordia, 82ff., 87f.
constructio ad sensum, 16, 52, 65, 77, 116, 123, 181, 256, 260
crimen pecuniarum repetundarum 126
custodia libera 228

dative after nouns, 188
deponents used passively, 76, 231
dignitas, 197
dissimulatio, 62, 91f., 93, 208
deus fidius, 197
domi nobiles, 120
doublets, 18, 33, 41, 42, 55, 61, 95, 107, 112, 132, 138, 144, 156, 194, 197, 211, 216, 229, 285

epic mannerism, 275
ellipse, 16, 37
explanatory clause
  in parenthesis, 14, 36
  in lieu of subord. causal cl., 15, 38, 78, 95, 121, 211

figura etymologica, 18, 79, 198
fortuna, 80, 88f., 215, 269
frequentative verbs, 18, 36, 74

gerundive, genitive of without prep., 74
gnomic perfect, 91, 94, 241, 246, 282
gloria, 32, 49f., 78f.
gratia, 141f.
Grecisms, 20, 214, 265

hyperbaton 15, 75, 82, 146

in with neut. adj. in lieu of simple adj. or adverb, 20, 103, 215, 259
inconcinnitas, 14f., 36, 80, 104, 107, 114, 116, 204, 209, 212, 282
infinitive
  adverbial, 65, 258
  descriptive, 165
  epexegetic, 157
  historic, 19, 73, 100, 114, 116
  historic combined with finite tense, 20, 95, 104, 114, 161, 286
  historic passive, 20, 92, 170
imprecision of terminology, 32, 35
intentus + abl.(?), 42, 54f.

interrogatio, 125
inversion of expected order, 16, 107, 124, 202
iuventus, 99f., 107f., 120, 205f.
ius provocationis, 177, 249f., 268

leges ambitus, 124
legitumi dies, 127
lex
  Cornelia de proscriptione, 206
  Licinia-Sextia, 192
  Plautia, 183
  Poetelia Papiria, 191
  Porcia, 177, 249
  Sempronia, 177, 249
  Sempronia frumentaria, 192
  Valeria de aere alieno, 193
  Valeria de provocatione, 249
lists, 14, 71, 141
luxuria, 96, 102f.

magnitudo animi, 62, 272
mali, 76, 203
metaphors, 92, 94, 107, 112, 202f., 267
minores magistratus, 181
modal gerund, 80, 287
mos maiorum, 66, 240, 242, 253, 263ff., 266

narrative method, 12f., 30, 34, 42, 56f., 58f., 63, 66ff., 69, 86, 104f., 109, 114f., 122f., 133, 134f., 169, 184, 239, 286
neologisms, 19, 104, 216, 288
neuter plural predicate with feminine nouns 65, 91, 137
nobiles, 120, 141
number
  of verb with collective noun, 16, 77, 121, 160
  of verb with *quisque*, 205
  of verb with *uterque*, 233
  of pronoun with collective noun 278

oratio obliqua
  indicative with *dum* in, 281
  subordinate clauses in, 108, 171, 236
  variation of tenses in, 188, 194, 195, 214
otium, 53

pactio provinciae, 167
parataxis, 14f., 36, 51, 61, 63, 77, 78, 80, 101f., 115, 136, 139, 171, 204, 205, 234
participle, perfect passive used for verbal nouns, 20, 35, 219
patria potestas, 212
passive phrasing, 19, 86, 234f.
patrocinium, 215, 232
per instrumental and modal, 19f., 75, 77, 103, 137f., 144, 205, 216
perfect tense, 3rd pl. ending, 144f.
pluperfect for aorist perfect, 130, 161, 202, 237
polar expressions, 16, 95, 97, 112, 180, 267

quaestor pro praetore, 131

secessiones, 193
senatus consultum ultimum, 175ff.
sources, 30f., 47, 88, 103
supine with *ire*, 202
synesis, 114, 122, 217

topos, 29, 45, 49, 50, 56, 90, 97, 101, 194, 223, 261, 280, 282, 283, 286 bis

variatio, 16, 54, 66, 86, 93, 101, 110, 116
virtus, 32, 35, 39f., 43f., 69, 74, 82, 86, 144, 265, 268, 273, 274

INDEX VERBORUM

(References are to pages)

abdicare, 227
absolvere de, 56
admonere de, 66
adulescentulus, 50f.
agere, 55
agitare, 36
alienus, 203
alius, 71, 258, 272
amplius, 145

coepi, (constr.), 99
colos, 113
comperiri, 155
conscientia, 64f., 111f.
consuevit, (impers.), 153
copia, 81, 120f., 241, 269
crescere, 91
cultus, 103
cupiditas, 36
cupido, 36
curare, 85, 284

dicere, (attracted), 234
doctus, (constr.), 164
dubitare, (constr.), 110
ductare, 96

effeminare, 94
egere, (constr.), 35
eloquentia, 62, 271
equidem, 247
exagitatus, 175
exemplum, 252
exitium, 276f.
exitum, 214, 276
expers, (constr.), 191

facinus, 43
facundia, 269
ferentarii, 286
filii familiarum, 219, cf. 245
foedus, 113
formidulosus, 76
foret, 108

gratia, 157
gratiam facere, 260

habere, 34, 54, 94, 204, 246
haud, 45
haveto, 199
huiusce modi, 110

igitur, 35
incedere, 77
incipere, 138
innocentia, 99, 274
inquilinus, 187
intempesta nox, 171
invadere, 38
ipse, 129
item, 220
iuxta, 42, 206

licet, 197
locus, 97
longe, 201
longius, 174

malle, 121
maturare, 130
mentiri 231
-met, 139f.
mortalis, 34
multo, 201
munificentia, 272

nam, 14
ne, 265
ne = *nedum*, 98
necessitudo, 117
novare, 210
novissume, 192

obnoxius, 108
obstare, 266
oreretur, 195

parere, 41
parricida, 187
partes, 56, 207
patere, 88, 280
patiens, 61
patrare, 130
percellere, 72

pensi, 64, 100
percontatus, 213
periculum, 37
permittere, 223
plerusque, 120
popularis, 152
postremo, 108
portare, 73
potentia, 98
potiri, 227
praestare, 204
prorsus, 116

-que, (alternative), 81
-que -que, 19, 85
queat, 283
qui, (abl.), 250
quin, 198, 271
quippe, 98
quippe qui, 229
quis = *quibus*, 123
quisquam, 61, 261
quisque, 205
quo = *ut*, 19, 96f., 190

relicui, 97

sed, 14
senatus, 178
sequi, 99, 274
sicut(i), 114, 172, 185
simul, 133
simul ac, 77
solet, 153, 175
subigere, 92
supplicium, 85

tametsi - tamen, 136
tum demum, 37
tumultus, 285

ubique, 148
utrique, 16, 179

vacuus, 264
vastare, 112
vastus, 62
venenum, 94
vexare, 65